

REGIS COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 1761 04833 3215

REPORT OF
A COMMITTEE
HOLDEN PULHAM PALACE
1900

The Doctrine of Holy Communion and its Expression in Ritual.

LIBRARY OF
ARTHUR W. JENKS,
Rector

REPORT OF A CONFERENCE HELD AT FULHAM PALACE IN OCTOBER 1900.

Bx
502
R6
190

EDITED BY

HENRY WACE, D.D.,

Chairman of the Conference.

REGIS
BIBL. MAJ.
COLLEGE

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

1900

90244

Cambridge:

PRINTED BY J. AND C. F. CLAY,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

INTRODUCTION.

THE following pages contain a report of the proceedings of a Conference which was summoned by me in pursuance of a Resolution passed at the London Diocesan Conference on May 16th 1900. The Resolution was

“That this Conference request the President to appoint a Round Table Conference, consisting of members of the Church of England, on Ritual and the Doctrines involved therein, to name the members, and to fix the terms of reference.”

This resolution imposed a large responsibility upon me and required careful consideration of the questions to be referred and of the persons who should be invited to discuss them. My proceeding may best be explained by the two following letters :

FULHAM PALACE,
July 20, 1900.

DEAR ———,

I was requested by a resolution of the London Diocesan Conference in May last to summon a Round Table Conference of members of the Church of England to confer on matters which are at present agitating the Church.

I would invite you to take part in such a Conference. I propose that it should be held here on Oct. 11, 12, 13 next.

The subject which I would refer to it for discussion is:—

“The doctrine of the Holy Communion and its expression in Ritual.”

I sincerely hope you may be able to attend.

Yours very truly

M. LONDON:

FULHAM PALACE,

Aug. 28, 1900.

DEAR ———,

Round Table Conference on Ritual.

I am now able to give you more definite information about the arrangements which I have been able to make.

The following have been good enough to accept my invitation:—

Rev. Dr BARLOW.
 Rev. H. E. J. BEVAN.
 Rev. Dr BIGG.
 Mr W. J. BIRKBECK.
 Rev. N. DIMOCK.
 Rev. Canon GORE.
 Viscount HALIFAX.
 Rev. Prof. MOULE.
 Rev. Canon NEWBOLT.
 Rev. Dr ROBERTSON.
 Rev. Canon ROBINSON.
 Rev. Professor SANDAY.
 Mr P. V. SMITH.
 EARL OF STAMFORD.
 Rev. Dr WACE.

I propose that all the members of the Conference should stay here during the time of meeting. I think that opportunity for private talk between the sittings would be of great value. I hope that all will come in time for dinner at 8 p.m. on Wed. Oct. 10th. Some agreement about procedure and sittings might be made that night.

I would explain that it is not my wish to interfere in the proceedings of the Conference, which will make its own regulations.

I think, however, that its proceedings would be greatly helped if each member were to send me, not later than Oct. 5th, a statement of his belief on the subject of the Divine gift in Holy Communion. The statement should be positive, not negative—what he holds, not what he wishes to exclude.

The proceedings of the Conference will terminate early on the afternoon of the 13th.

There will be a celebration of the Holy Communion each morning during the sessions.

We will all prepare ourselves meanwhile by praying that God's Holy Spirit may enable us to speak the truth in love.

I am

Yours very faithfully

M. LONDON:

My desire was to bring together various phases of theological opinion as represented by theologians whose training enabled them to talk a common language. The object of the Conference was that it should record opinions, not that it should attempt to elaborate new formulae. The form of the Conference was that it was a committee appointed to report to me. It presented its report by submitting a copy of its minutes.

It will be noticed that I was responsible for asking for the statements of opinion which were sent in previously by the various members. These statements approach the question from various points of view. If anyone feels disappointed at this he must lay the blame on the language of my request, not on the writers.

I took no personal part in the proceedings, for I felt that any appearance of official intervention would have destroyed their usefulness. One thing only I would add—that all the members of the Conference expressed to me their appreciation of the tact and skill of Dr Wace as chairman. It is to him that the minutes in their present form are due.

It would be out of place for me to make any comment upon the contents of the following pages. They will be most useful to the reader who is his own commentator.

M. LONDON :

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Introduction	3
Preliminary meeting	9
Statements of belief by members of the Conference .	11
First Session	42
Second Session	48
Third Session	59
Fourth Session	70
Fifth Session	84
List of members of the Conference	97

NOTE.

In accordance with the arrangement mentioned on p. 96, the following Minutes have been submitted in print to all members of the Conference; and except in some points of detail, which it was necessary for the Editor to settle, all their emendations have been introduced.

MINUTES OF THE CONFERENCE.

THE Conference assembled on Wednesday, October 10, at 9 p.m.; and on the motion of Lord HALIFAX, seconded by Prebendary BARLOW, D.D., Dr WACE was elected Chairman. It was subsequently agreed that Dr Wace, by accepting the office of Chairman, was not to regard himself as precluded from taking part in the proceedings as an ordinary member of the Conference.

It was agreed that the Sessions of the Conference should be held each day from 10.30 a.m. to 1 p.m., and from 4.15 p.m. to 6.45 p.m.; the Holy Communion being celebrated each morning, preceded by Mattins at 8 a.m., and Evensong being said at 7 p.m.

It was decided that certain subjects should be assigned to the various Sessions as follows:—

On Thursday morning :—

The nature of the Divine Gift in the Holy Communion.

On Thursday afternoon :—

The relation between the Divine Gift and the consecrated Elements.

On Friday morning :—

The Sacrificial aspect of the Holy Communion.

On Friday afternoon :—

The expression in Ritual of the doctrine of the Holy Communion.

On Saturday morning :—

Supplementary discussion, including the Report to be made to the Bishop of London.

It was further agreed to take as the basis, or point of departure, for the doctrinal discussions the statement by the Rev. N. DIMOCK which had been made in obedience to the request in the Bishop of London's second letter, and which, with most of the other statements, was before the Conference in printed form.

It was resolved that members of the Conference should not be required to speak in any fixed order, and that no stated limit of time should be imposed on speakers ; but it was understood that, subject to the Chairman's discretion in particular cases, members should endeavour to confine their remarks within a space of from five to ten minutes.

The following are the statements of the belief of members of the Conference, sent to the Bishop of London in response to his request in the second letter printed in his Introduction. Mr DIMOCK's statement is prefixed, as the one selected by the Conference as the basis of its discussions ; and the others are printed in alphabetical order. They were issued to members before the Conference met, with this introductory note :—

The following statements from members of the Conference are circulated in the hope that their perusal by all may facilitate the consideration of the best method of procedure.

M. LONDON:

(I) Rev. N. DIMOCK.

My position is:

I. That, in consecration, a change is effected as regards the elements, which may be called a Divine Change, a change which could only be effected by the "omnipotency of Christ's Word," a change of use, not of substance nor of nature—grace being added to nature.

II. That in use, the consecrated elements are effectual signs for the purpose of the ordinance, seals of donation, and so truly "exhibitive" proxies of the THINGS signified, whose Names they bear in the delivery—Which are thus verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful, being really present for the manducation of faith—"Cui præsentia sunt omnia præterita" [Rupert. Tuit.].

III. That this Real Presence may be truly called an "Objective Presence," because faith is not imagination, and faith believes only what is really and objectively true, and takes and receives only what is truly and objectively offered. But is not a Presence *in* or *under* the Elements "considered in themselves"—though the negation of the *trans*, *con*, *sub*, *in*, &c., viewed *simply* as *modes* of the Presence does not belong to that which is *de fide*.

IV. That, though not *the* purpose of the Ordinance, there may be truly said to be an Offering, i.e. to the Divine view, of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ, or of Christ Himself, in representation, not *re*-presentation, symbolically, not hypostatically, offered to view—not as making, but as having made once for all the perfect propitiation for the sins of the world.

V. That Christ "the Living One, Who became a Dead Man" is to be adored as Present in the *Sacrament* understood as the *Ordinance*, not the *outward and visible sign*.

VI. That in the Sacrament, as in the Scriptures (for in the Scriptures also we feed upon the Body and Blood of Christ—Tert., Orig., Hieron., &c.), the primary and prominent aspect of the gift is "the remission of sins" (as the *immediate* result of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ, and as so indicated in the words of Institution). And therefore we may be truly said to *feed on* "*the remission of sins*" (Amb. &c.). And that the *Res sacramenti* is not Christ as He now is, but Christ's Body and Blood as separated in Sacrificial Death for our sins.

VII. That this primary aspect of the gift is not to be separated from the secondary and resulting view of "all other benefits of His Passion," including the power of His resurrection Life, whereby He is "alive for evermore," and dwells in us and we in Him. That thus we are made partakers of the Crucified Body directly, and of the Glorified Body consequentially. "We eat Christ Crucified in the Sacrament as we partake of the merits of His Death; and if we thus have part in His Crucified Body, we are thereby *ipso facto* made partakers of His Body glorified." (Waterland.)

(2) The Rev. Prebendary BARLOW, D.D.

In replying to the Bishop's letter, I desire to limit myself to a few words only.

1. As to the Real Presence. The well-known words of Hooker satisfy me: "The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament."

2. With Waterland I understand that the feeding on Christ in the Holy Communion, is on the crucified Christ, and that the union is with the glorified Christ.

3. In the words of the consecration prayer, I believe that the elements though set apart to a high and holy purpose remain "the creatures of bread and wine."

4. I believe that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is intended for the perfecting of the saints; as the Sacrament of Baptism is that of initiation into the body of Christ.

5. The title of the Sacrament used in the Prayer Book, "The Lord's Supper," should (to my mind) be carefully retained as going back to the time of the institution.

6. The ritual connected with this Sacrament should, as I think, set forth the simplicity and spirituality of the service as appointed by Christ.

7. "The body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith."

8. "To such as rightly, worthily and with faith receive" the Sacrament, "the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ."

9. To such persons, the Sacrament is a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves, one to another. It is a badge and token of a Christian man's profession.

10. The sacrifices presented to God by the worthy communicant are: the offering of themselves; thanksgiving; and alms-giving.

(3) Rev. H. E. J. BEVAN.

A. (1) While I think one may wisely keep an open mind as to the nature of a mystery (the precise *when* and *where* and *how* of the Divine Presence in the Eucharist) which the N.T.

does not explain or define, and may therefore feel justified in adopting the spirit of Queen Elizabeth's famous dictum :—

“ Christ was the Word, and spake it
He took the Bread, and brake it
And what the Word doth make it
That I believe, and take it ; ”

(2) Nevertheless, I am inclined to accept the position of Hooker and Waterland as being that of the Church of England, because, while it fully vindicates the sacramental nature and value of the rite, it does not limit and confine the Sacramental gift to the material elements, thereby claiming for a *part* of the rite exclusively the spiritual efficacy that belongs rather to the *whole*.

I am of opinion, moreover, that our Lord's teaching in St John vi., and elsewhere, militates against any dogmatic interpretation of the words of Institution (“ This is my Body ”; “ this is my Blood ”) which insists that His *living* Spiritual presence must needs be regarded as definitely located in the dead matter of the consecrated bread and wine.

It seems more in accordance with the tenor of His teaching, to believe that the Spiritual gift is conveyed *through* the elements to the soul of the faithful receiver, as by a divinely appointed instrument (cf. St Bernard), than *within* them.

B. I believe that the Eucharist has a *twofold sacrificial* aspect, in that it (1) “ shews forth ” the benefits of the Saviour's atonement “ until He come ”: and (2) symbolises the “ reasonable, holy and lively ” sacrifice of “ ourselves, our souls and bodies.”

C. As regards the *Ritual* question, it will follow from the view expressed above that Reverence, rather than Adoration, is due to the Consecrated Elements,—*not* as though they held imprisoned or embodied the Divine Presence within themselves, but as being an integral and essential part of the Sacrament in its fulness.

(4) Rev. Dr BIGG.

The Divine Gifts which I believe that I receive in Holy Communion are Forgiveness and Life—Life including knowledge of the Divine Will, cheerful readiness to obey it, and power to do what my own inclinations and abilities would forbid. Forgiveness I believe to flow from the Death of our Lord, Life from His Resurrection, but the two are inseparable in the Personality of Christ and in the unity of the Trinity.

I believe that the Bread and Wine are Symbols of the Body and Blood ; that they are the highest of all Symbols ; that in heaven there are no Symbols.

Hence I believe all Symbols to be partly real and partly unreal—real in so far as they truly communicate the two ultimate realities, the perfect nature of man and the perfect nature of God—which in Christ are one reality, I know not how—unreal in so far as they are transient and therefore not necessary.

As to the mode in which the reality of the Symbol is linked to the unreality I have no knowledge and no belief.

When I say that Symbols are not necessary it will be understood that I use the word “necessary” in its strict sense. In regard to our present condition Symbols are necessary.

(5) W. J. BIRKBECK, Esq.

I believe that, in the Eucharist, under the Sacramental species of bread and wine, the faithful partake of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and unto everlasting life. And for the further elucidation of this mystery, I appeal to the belief and practice of the ancient undivided Catholic Church of Christ, as they appear in the primitive Liturgies and the writings of the Fathers of the Church.

In the writings of the Fathers of the undivided Church, I find, firstly, that the “Gifts” or “Oblations”—that is to say, the

species of bread and wine—are said to be changed, transfigured, transformed, converted, transmuted or transelemented into the Body and Blood of Christ. I find, secondly, that there are other occasions, when they say that in this Food there are two things, one heavenly and the other earthly; and thirdly, they sometimes say, though more rarely, that Christ made the bread to be His Body, that is to say, the figure of His Body, and that the bread does not depart from its proper nature.

It is self-evident that any one of these three modes of speaking of the Holy Eucharist may easily be pressed to a point at which it would exclude the other two. As a matter of history, while I observe that, immediately after the division of the Church into East and West they actually did become the subject of controversy, I, at the same time, take note of the fact that before the Great Schism, although they may have been sometimes employed as illustrations in other controversies, these modes of expression themselves remained each of them unchallenged. From this I infer, that unless we can ourselves make use of these expressions in the same sense in which the Fathers employed them, it is self-evident that in some respect we have shifted our ground from that of the undivided Church, and that damage has been done to the analogy of the Faith.

But further, it is not only with reference to man's food in the Eucharist, but also with reference to man himself in Baptism that we find the same three different forms of language, and in the same degrees of relative frequency and emphasis, used by the Fathers. For first, the Fathers repeatedly say that we are in Baptism changed, transfigured, transformed, transmuted, transelemented. The Fathers in using these say freely and ordinarily that the old man born of the flesh of Adam dies; that we are created anew and born again; that we are new creatures in Christ, members of His Body, of His bones and of His flesh; that the old man is put off, and is done away. But they say also *secondly* on other occasions, that in the Baptized Christian there are two natures, two lives, one from the first Adam, and another from the second; and that the second Adam must contend against the first until the whole body of sin be abolished. And

again *thirdly* they say, though more rarely, that the Baptized do not really die nor rise again, but by a figure are made partakers of Christ, and that they remain after Baptism the very same men, children of Adam as before.

It therefore seems to me that the doctrine of the Eucharist is capable of being evolved from the doctrine of Baptism (not by comparing the sanctification of the water in Baptism with the sanctification of the bread and wine in the Eucharist, but) by virtue of that correlation which exists between the life or living creature which needs food and the food (in a sense consubstantial with it) that feeds it. There is a certain necessary relation between the thing, name, and idea of generation or *birth* and the thing, name, and idea of *food*. If a nature needing food was not in living creatures which are born, such a thing as food could not be. Accordingly, when our Lord announced the *new birth*, which was to restore the life of man, a *new food* to sustain that life would seem naturally to follow.

But to natural reason the "new birth" of a man already born was either a mere metaphor or figure of speech, or a contradiction in terms, and an impossibility. But our Lord answered Nicodemus' objection, not by "I speak only figuratively," but, with a double asseveration, He repeated what He had said, and then only added, to remove misconception, that this was not any such natural or carnal birth as Nicodemus understood, but a supernatural, heavenly and spiritual birth, not of flesh but of spirit, that which is born of the flesh being flesh and that which is born of the spirit being spirit, so that the two interfere not the one with the other.

And thus we arrive at the parallel between Baptism and the Holy Eucharist in all three of the modes of speech already referred to.

In the case of the new birth we have, *first*, that which is the object of faith and not of sense, namely, that which being born of spirit as of a second Adam is spirit; *secondly*, that which is the object of sight and sense, namely, the man that is already born, the flesh born of the first Adam; and *thirdly*, the union of

these two in one and the self-same subject. And we may say the same in regard to the new food.

If we speak according to the spirit we shall say that the natural food, inasmuch as it is not said to be united to some other thing which is made spirit of spirit, but is said to become and to be itself the new food, will necessarily be changed ; and changed too inwardly and essentially, not outwardly or accidentally. We shall say that the natural food will have been done away, and will have ceased to be, that it will have passed into a new thing. But if any misconception (like that of Nicodemus respecting the new birth) causes us to look back to the order of nature, to that which is after the flesh, we shall say that according to the flesh, that is, according to the order of nature, and as to its natural substance, the food remains the same as before and has by no means undergone any physical change. And lastly, speaking of the two orders of grace and nature conjointly, we may say that there are in the food two things, an outward and an inward, and in a certain sense two foods, the one consubstantial (in the sense that food is consubstantial with that which it sustains) with the first Adam, natural, earthly, and corruptible, the other consubstantial with the second Adam, supernatural, heavenly, and incorruptible, the earthly food after the flesh and the spiritual food after the spirit, and these two will not interfere the one with the other.

Subject to these considerations I adopt the language of the ancient Liturgies, which all of them assert or imply the reality of the conversion of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of our Lord. Thus the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom at the consecration of the sacred species prays the Father to send His Holy Spirit "upon us and upon these gifts presented before Thee, and make this bread the precious Body of Thy Christ and that which is in this cup the precious Blood of Thy Christ, changing them by Thy Holy Spirit." Again, the prayer which is said by both priest and deacon before receiving the Holy Communion and which afterwards is again read on behalf of the laity who communicate, contains the following words : "I

believe that this is Thy most pure Body indeed, and that this is Thy precious Blood indeed."

That the bread and wine in the Holy Eucharist *are* after consecration Christ's Body and Blood, which they were not before, seems to me to be the constant doctrine of the whole Catholic and Apostolic Church, received originally from the lips of the Lord Himself, Who said, "This is My Body," and Who, having created all things, knew also how to employ words, nor left it to any man to modify the force of His words or to substitute others in their stead. But while it is clear that this is so, and quite independently of the individual faith or disposition of individual recipients of the Holy Sacrament, I would point out that there is nothing either in the teaching or the practice of the ancient undivided Church which implies a belief in a mere mechanical conversion of the sacred elements into that which they signify. That conversion takes place, as is so clearly shown in the language of the Liturgies, in answer to prayer; and while the benefits whereof we are partakers by receiving the Holy Sacrament depend upon our faith and God's grace, as appears in the prayer of our Church, that we may "so eat the Flesh of Thy dear Son, Jesus Christ, and drink His Blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean through His Body, and our souls washed through His most precious Blood," the Presence of our Lord in His Sacrament primarily depends neither upon the prayers nor the acts of individual men, whether they be priests or laymen, but upon the prayers, and the faith (which alone can obtain answers to prayer) of the Church herself. The priest and the layman have their part in the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, appointed them by the Church; but it is the faith of the Church, and her obedience to the commands of her Divine Head, which enables her confidently to assure them that their prayer in respect to this and every other Sacrament will be, and is, answered.

(6) Rev. Canon GORE.

I believe that 'the bread which we break is a communion in the body of Christ' and 'the cup of blessing which we bless is a communion in the blood of Christ' (1 Cor. x. 16); and I would explain this belief, as far as may be, thus:

1. I believe that, as reported by St John, our Lord asserted the principle that those who believed in Him were to eat His flesh and drink His blood, and so to eat *Him*, in His whole person, and live by Him, to abide in Him and have Him abiding in them (John vi. 52—7). By His flesh and blood must be meant, in some sense, His manhood¹. He warns us however against any gross understanding of 'flesh.' He directs our thoughts toward His *ascended and glorified* manhood (ver. 62). He bids us think of the subjects of His discourse—His flesh and blood—as being spirit and life (ver. 63), even as St Paul describes the risen Christ as 'life-giving spirit' (1 Cor. xv. 45). Therefore I cannot express better what I understand by the flesh of Christ which we are to eat than by saying that it is the spiritual principle of His manhood² which we are to assimilate by faith, or what I understand by His blood better than by appealing to the well-known principle of the O.T. that 'the blood is the life.' It is the vitality of His manhood, inseparable from His whole person. From another point of view I would express this principle in Dr Moule's words³ where he describes it as the special function of the Holy Spirit of Christ to 'effect an influx into the regenerate man of the blessed virtues of the nature of the second Adam, an infusion of the exalted life of Jesus Christ'; so that 'there is a continuity wholly spiritual indeed but none the less most real, unfigurative and efficacious, between the Head and the limb, between the Root and the branch.'

2. I conceive that 'the breaking of the bread' is the divinely appointed occasion and means for realizing the relationship to Christ described above. I think Waterland is right

¹ Westcott, *Revelation of the Father*, p. 40.

² As opposed, that is, to its material elements.

³ *Veni, Creator*, pp. 39f.

in claiming it as the fundamental and almost universally accepted principle of the sacraments, that "our union with the deity rests upon our mystical union with our Lord's humanity¹." And, as regards this particular sacrament, I believe that Christ instituted a perpetual memory of His sacrifice, and consecrated bread and wine to be His body and His blood, in order that we might eat His flesh and drink His blood, and thus, through His manhood, 'His whole entire person.' This is the doctrine that Hooker describes as representing in his day 'the general agreement².' I trust it may prove so in our conference.

3. I believe that the bestowal of this gift in sacramental form ('a heavenly under the form of an earthly nourishment,' Goethe) is in accordance with the twofold nature of man and the principle of the incarnation. But the special significance of the outward and visible sign in the eucharist I find in its character as a social meal—in the one bread broken and the one cup poured, which are at once the symbols and the instruments of the unity of the Church.

And I see in this eucharistic meal the realization of what seems to be, in the religions of the world, the root idea of sacrifice—that is, sacramental communion between the God and his worshippers, the binding together of men by common sharing in a life believed to be divine. This idea of communion with God and in God was under the Old Covenant severely restricted for purposes of moral discipline. But under the New Covenant it is, in its utmost spirituality, bountifully realized. Of our 'altar' we have a right to 'eat.' And, according to the deepest Christian conception, it is in sacramental communion that we find our special point of contact with Christ's sacrifice, in its abiding efficacy. It is in Christ that we can plead Christ.

4. I should like to say that in the above statement I have sought to confine myself as strictly as possible to the question of 'the nature of the divine gift in Holy Communion.' I have accordingly not considered either (a) the exact relation of the

¹ *Doctr. of the Euch.* (Oxford, 1880), p. 520.

² *Eccl. Pol.* v. lxvii. 7.

spiritual gift to the outward elements, or (*b*) the necessary condition for its appropriation, *viz.* that 'the mean whereby it is received is faith.'

(7) Lord HALIFAX.

Oct. 8th, 1900.

Statement of Belief as to the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice sent in at the request of the Bishop of London.

HALIFAX.

I believe that He, "Who spoke the word, and it was done, Who commanded and it was created," by the words spoken in His name, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, makes the Bread and Wine to be His Body and His Blood.

Or, in other words, that by virtue of the Consecration and by the sanctification of the Holy Ghost the Bread and Wine become, are made, are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ.

I believe that this change is Sacramental, in a sphere outside the cognizance of sense, to be accepted, and therefore to be apprehended only by faith.

Further, I believe that each Eucharist is a repetition of what our Blessed Lord did in the Last Supper.

That Christ mystically represented under the aspect of death by the separate Consecration of His Body and His Blood, offers Himself, presents Himself, is offered, is presented to the Father in commemoration of all He did or suffered for us throughout His whole life and upon the Cross. That each Eucharist is the showing forth of the one Sacrifice which is the complete and perfect satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, not by a mere verbal commemoration, as when we say "Through Jesus Christ our Lord," but by a commemoration consequent upon the actual presence under the sacramental forms, the outward and visible signs, of Him Who was Incarnate in the womb of the Blessed

Virgin, suffered, died on the Cross, rose again and ascended into Heaven for us, and Who by every valid Consecration is offered, exhibited, presented to the Father, under the separated symbols of Bread and Wine, sacramentally identified with His Body and Blood, as the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.

Further, as Christ, the second Adam and the Head of the human race by the sacrifice of Himself which He offered throughout His whole life, and on the Cross, was discharging all the obligations due from mankind collectively and individually to God, every member of Christ's Body, in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist which is the commemoration of that Sacrifice, is bound to take, so far as he can, his personal share in that Sacrifice, and to tread in the steps of His Saviour Christ by the offering of himself, body, soul, and spirit, in union with Christ's offering of Himself, as a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto God.

I would add, as Theological terms often convey to others meanings not intended by those who use them, five prayers which translate into practice, and give expression in the language of devotion to what is here stated as to the belief of those who accept the Faith of the Universal Church in regard to the doctrine of the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

PRAYERS AT THE HOLY COMMUNION.

A Prayer for the Conversion and Pardon of Sinners, in which the Passion and Death of Christ is offered to God the Father.

I thank Thine immeasurable goodness, O Eternal Father and God, Chief Lover of men, Who, to redeem us that were lost, and set us free from eternal torments, hast willingly delivered up Thy most innocent Son to most cruel pains and the bitterest of deaths.

O Love! O Pity incomprehensible! that for us that Immaculate Lamb should be given and tormented, than Whom was nothing more holy, nothing more excellent; that by dying He

might destroy our death, and by rising again restore us to true life! We, therefore, offer to Thee, O Father, this Thy most dear Son, this our Priest, our Chief Pontiff, this best and most faithful of Shepherds Who gave Himself up for us an oblation and a sacrifice in the odour of sweetness.

By that Face which won reconciliation for the world, we owe and we give eternal thanks to Thy Love; for His sake we dare to ask and hope for the conversion of all sinners, for the remission of our sins, and all grace: for He was made unto us Wisdom and Righteousness, and Sanctification and Redemption: by His bruises we are healed: He is the true and efficacious Propitiation for our sins and for the sins of the whole world.

We therefore pray, O Eternal Father, that Thou mayest receive in Thy clemency the Sacrifice of Thy most dearly beloved Son, our Mediator, which was offered to Thee on the Cross, than which nothing can be to Thee more acceptable, or of more avail to us. His tears, groans, and cry; His bonds, scourges, thorns, and wounds; His Cross, Blood, and Death, we offer to Thee, that they may bring a healing medicine to our souls, how wounded and impure soever. And that we may participate in the true fruit of this Most Holy Passion, and glory aright in so great a Mediator, grant to us and to all sinners that grace which is needful for all who are to be justified and saved; that so we may not only trust in the merits and promises of our Redeemer, but may be obedient also to His precepts, and walk in His footsteps, and by His example. Through the same Christ Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

A Meditation and Prayer of St. Bernard. For the Presentation of Christ Crucified to the Eternal Father.

Consider, my soul, consider. This is the Lord our God, Jesus Christ, thy Saviour; the Only-begotten Son of God, true God, true Man, Who alone beneath the sun was found without spot.

And, lo! He is thus numbered among the transgressors, and esteemed as a leper, the lowest of men; and, as an un-

timely birth is cast out, so is He cast out from the womb of His mother, the wretched synagogue. He, the fairest of the sons of men, how is He become marred ! He was wounded for our transgressions. He was bruised for our iniquities, and was made a holocaust of a most sweet odour in Thy sight, O Father of eternal glory, that He might turn away Thine indignation from us, and make us to sit with Himself in heavenly places.

Look down, O Lord, Holy Father, from Thy sanctuary, from the high habitation of Thy heavens ; and behold this holy offering, which our great High Priest offers Thee, Thy Holy Child, the Lord Jesus Christ, for the sins of His brethren ; and be placable towards the multitude of our offences. Lo ! the voice of the Blood of our Jesus crieth unto Thee from the Cross.

Look, O Lord, upon the Face of Thy Christ, Who became obedient to Thee, even unto death. O ! let His scars never pass from Thine eyes, that Thou mayest remember the greatness of the satisfaction Thou hast received from Him for our sins.

Let every tongue give Thee thanks, O Father, for the superabundance of Thy bounty, who hast not spared the Only Son of Thy heart, but hast delivered Him up to death for us all, that we may have Him as a faithful Advocate before Thee in heaven.

A Prayer of the same St. Bernard to Christ Crucified, which can be used also in behalf of all the Companions of the Love of Jesus.

I must needs love Thee, O Lord Jesu Christ, with my whole heart, with my whole soul, with my whole strength : and follow Thy steps, that hast vouchsafed to die for me. And how shall this be wrought in me but by Thee ? Let my soul cleave to Thee, for all its strength hangeth upon Thee.

And now, O Lord, my Redeemer, I adore Thee as Very God, I trust in Thee, I hope in Thee, and with all the desire in my power I pant after Thee ; help my imperfection.

Before the glorious tokens of The Passion, whereby Thou hast wrought out my salvation; I bow myself down wholly. In Thy Name, O Christ, I adore the royal standard of Thy victorious Cross. Thy thorny crown, Thy blood-red nails, the lance plunged into Thy sacred Side, Thy Wounds, Thy Blood, Thy Death, Thy Sepulchre, O Christ, I suppliantly adore and glorify.

By the virtue of these keep me from the wiles of Satan, and strengthen me, that the yoke of Thy commandments may become sweet to me; and the burden of the Cross, which Thou biddest me carry after Thee, may be light to the shoulders of my soul.

Fix my hands and my feet to Thy Cross, and wholly conform Thy servant, O Lord, to the likeness of Thy Passion: fashion also Thy servant after Thy Life-giving Death, working in me, that I may die according to the flesh, but live according to the Spirit of righteousness. Bless God my Saviour, O my soul, and magnify His Name for ever. Amen.

Another Prayer.

O most merciful Father and everlasting God, Who hast vouchsafed to call us into the fellowship of Thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord, and dost feed us in this Holy Sacrament, with His most precious Body and Blood; Behold, I now enfold Him in my bosom and possess Him as my own most closely united with me, and thus possessing Him and possessed by Him in the unity of that love by which He once gave Himself for us on the Altar of the Cross, and now giveth and communicateth Himself to us in the Sacrament of the Altar, do I offer Him unto Thee together with all His merits and virtues to Thy eternal praise and glory, that in Him Thou may'st be perfectly well pleased, and that we, who by our own deeds, are not able to please Thee, by the merits and intercession of Thy most well beloved Son may be made perfectly pleasing unto Thee.

I offer unto Thee, O most Holy Father, all His charity, piety, obedience, humility, poverty, gentleness, patience, love,

and all the other virtues which He had surpassingly, trusting that by them my defects may be supplied; and since I cannot thank Thee as I ought for all the benefits conferred upon me I offer Thee all the praises which He himself once offered when He was visible upon earth, and those which He now offers unto Thee in His Glory. And forasmuch as I cannot satisfy Thee for all my debts, that is, my sins, I offer unto Thee, O most Holy Father, all the labours, fastings, watchings, weariness, prayers, whatsoever in fine He did or suffered from the first moment of His Conception until He gave up the ghost for us upon the Cross; all the griefs and torments of His Passion, the blood for me poured out, the wounds for me received, the death which He endured in my stead. Holy Father, look upon the face of Thy Christ. Under the shadow and protection of His merits do I appear unto Thee, that looking chiefly upon Him thou may'st regard me also with mercy and favour whom He has purchased and made His servant for ever. Suffer not that soul to perish which so often receiveth into itself Thy Son Who, sent by Thee, came into the world to seek and to save that which was lost.

A Prayer After Communion.

Behold, O Lord, I now have Thee, Who hast all things; I possess Thee, Who possessest all things and canst do all things; therefore, O my God and my All, do Thou wean my heart from all other things beside Thee, for in them there is nothing but vanity and vexation of spirit; on Thee alone may my heart be fixed; in Thee be my rest, for in Thee is my treasure, in Thee is the sovereign truth, and true happiness, and eternal life.

Let my soul, O Lord, feel the sweetness of Thy presence. May it taste how sweet Thou art, O Lord, that allured by love of Thee, it may seek for nothing wherein to rejoice out of Thee; for Thou art the Joy of my heart, and my God, and my Portion for ever.

O my Lord and my God! Behold I am Thy servant; give me understanding and kindle my affections that I may know and do Thy will.

Thou art the Lamb of God, the Lamb without spot, Who takest away the sins of the world ; take away from me whatever hurteth me and displeaseth Thee ; and give me what Thou knowest to be pleasing to Thee and good for me.

Thou art my Love and all my Joy : Thou art my God and my All : Thou art the Portion of mine inheritance and of my cup : Thou art He Who shall maintain my lot.

O my God and my All ! may the sweet and burning power of Thy love, I beseech Thee, absorb my soul, that I may die unto the world for the love of Thee, Who for the love of me hast vouchsafed to die upon the Cross, O my God and my All !

(8) Rev. Dr MOULE.

1. As to the *Manner* of Gift. In the Ordinance our Lord, present according to His Promise where His disciples meet in His name, "gives" to His disciples *after the manner of Signification* ; that is, so as both to illustrate and to consign or seal to the faithful their part and lot in the related Blessing.

So, "the inward part of the Lord's Supper" is called by the Church "the Thing signified." So, this Sacrament is "a sure witness and effectual sign of grace and God's good will to us ; by which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken (*excitat*) but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him."

This manner of giving may be in measure illustrated by the operation of seal, book, or ring, in human conveyance of estate. (So Bernard, *Sermo in Cænâ*.)

2. As to the *Matter* of the Gift. The Lord "gives," in the Ordinance, His own holy "Body and Blood, which are verily and indeed taken and received, by the faithful, in the Lord's Supper" ; so that, "to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ, and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ." In the concurrent language

of the Church (Art. 28), the Ordinance is "a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's Death." And this distinctively and supremely.

For the occasion, the action, and the full words, of the Institution, all define the sacred Body in our Lord's thought to be the Body as in Death, and the sacred Blood to be the Blood as in Death; that is, as in the act and process of the One Sacrifice which is our Redemption. By the Body and the Blood I thus humbly understand to be "signified" the Means of our Redemption—themselves belonging to the past, but in their redeeming Effect ever present.

That Effect (in which alone the Body and the Blood, *as in Death*, still "are") is "given" to the faithful, and received by them, from the Lord, in the Ordinance, after the manner of Signification. It is so "given" for renewed Remembrance, Fruition, and Thanksgiving.

3. Indirectly, and because to possess Redemption is to possess the Redeemer, there is "given" to us therein, in like manner, our union with the Lord now in His glory for all purposes of our blessing in Him. This however is rather a sure inference than a revelation.

4. Subordinately, according to the Apostle's testimony (1 Cor. x.), there is "given" to us, in like manner, in the Ordinance, our union and communion with the whole faithful Church.

(9) Rev. Canon NEWBOLT.

I believe that the Holy Communion was ordained "for the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby"; and that this "remembrance" is in the first place a memorial before God, because "Christ instituted not only a remembrance of the Sacrifice to ourselves, but also a special mode of pleading it before God," whereby we offer the same Body once for all sacrificed for us, and the same Blood once for all shed for us,

sacramentally present, to the Father. I believe that, inasmuch as the Holy Communion is a Sacrament, it has an outward and an inward part. But I am further instructed in the Church Catechism, that whereas Baptism has an outward sign, which is water, and an inward grace which is new birth, Holy Communion has, which Baptism has not, an "inward part or thing signified," so that whereas the questions and answers which have to do with the essential nature of Baptism are *two*, those which have to do with the essential nature of Holy Communion are *three*. That is to say, there is the outward sign of Bread and Wine, and there are the spiritual benefits which are "the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ &c.," but there is also that which is lacking in Baptism, an inward part which is "the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper"—a distinction which is represented in theological language by the *Sacramentum*, i.e. the Bread and Wine, substantially and really present; the *Res Sacramenti*, i.e. the 'thing signified,' which is the Body and Blood of Christ, which are "taken" as well as received, or in the words of Article xxviii. "given, taken and eaten"—"by the faithful in the Lord's Supper"; and the *Virtus Sacramenti*, i.e. the spiritual feeding on Christ, whereby the faithful are made partakers of Christ, so that the gift bestowed in the Holy Communion is the Body and Blood of Christ which are present really and truly but spiritually and ineffably under the outward visible part, sign or form of Bread and Wine.

"The manner of the Presence is mysterious, ineffable and inconceivable by us, (as) it is in Heaven, and there only, that Christ is present according to the natural mode of His existence."

I believe further that those who come to this Holy Communion with a penitent heart and lively faith, are thereby made partakers of Christ, and are made one with Him; whereas the wicked and they that are void of faith, where it was possible to them to receive it *sacramentally* or *spiritually*, or *sacramentally* and *spiritually* both—receive it only sacramentally, i.e. "so"

receive it, that their sinful bodies are *not* made clean by Christ's Body, nor their souls washed by His most precious Blood, that is, receive it to their condemnation, not discerning the Lord's Body, and so in no wise are "partakers of Christ." In other words they receive the Sacrament, but not the virtue of the Sacrament.

I believe further that although it is not in accordance with Christ's ordinance that the Sacrament should be reserved for the express purpose of being carried about, lifted up or worshipped, yet that "Christ Himself, the inward part of the Sacrament, in and with the Sacrament, apart from and without the Sacrament, wheresoever He is, is to be worshipped," i.e. that "Christ Himself, really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably present in the Sacrament, is therein to be adored." I believe further that this Presence remains *extra usum Sacramenti*, so that "if any (Bread and Wine) remain of that which is consecrated," it may not be treated like ordinary bread and wine. I believe further in the words of Mr Keble, "It has so happened in the providence of God that the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist has never been subject to similar enactments (i.e. similar to the decrees of true œcumenical councils) until the 11th or 12th century, after the separation of East and West. Well therefore may each person, or each portion of the Church, for himself or itself, form strong opinions and express them strongly as God shall guide them, on the several points involved in the doctrine; but to impose them as articles of faith, making those heretics who demur to them, they are not, I conceive, competent, except the point be such an one as can be shown to have been *unequivocally* received by the whole Church from the beginning, such as (e.g.) the Inspiration of Holy Scripture."

(10) Rev. Dr ROBERTSON.

Salvation.

1. The doctrine of the Eucharist cannot be profitably analysed without reference to the elements of Christian doctrine as 'knowledge of salvation' (Luke i. 77).

2. Christ's salvation comprises, as distinguishable but inseparable elements, (a) Forgiveness of Sin, (b) Knowledge of God, (c) Eternal Life.

(a) The Forgiveness of Sin is achieved by the Death of Christ. For this reason the Death of Christ is spoken of as a Sacrifice (St Luke i. 77; Rom. iii. 24 f.).

(b) The Knowledge of God comes to us through the teaching and example of Christ (Joh. xiv. 10).

(c) Eternal Life comes to us by our Union with God through Christ (Joh. xvii. 3, vi. 57).

Grace.

3. The term 'Grace' is generically applicable to the benefits, gained for mankind once for all in the Saving Work of Christ, as conveyed to the believing soul.

4. Of Grace, Faith is the universal condition and means.

Means of Grace.

5. Faith comprises the acceptance of the positive commands of Christ.

6. Sacraments are acts appointed by Christ to be done by His followers, to which acts He has attached the promise of Specific Grace.

7. The work of Christ is therefore applied to the Soul (a) by Faith, (b) by Sacraments as acts of Faith.

8. Sacraments are means of Grace, not by virtue of the act done, nor of the faith of the participant, but by virtue of the Word of Christ. (Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit Sacramentum.)

Essential meaning of the Sacrament.

9. To interpret a particular Sacrament, regard must be had [solely] to the grace whereof that Sacrament is a means.

The Eucharist.

10. The Eucharist (a) continues in us the divine life (*supr.* 2 c) which Baptism begins, and (b) makes us (as Baptism has in

the first instance done, Rom. vi. 2, 3) partakers of the Death of Christ.

11. The grace of the Eucharist [sacramental partaking of Christ] differs from that of Baptism [sacrament of new birth] as the maintenance of life from its beginning.

12. In both of the above respects (10) the Eucharist is a real partaking of Christ; as real as the Church is really His Body.

13. St Paul's conception of the Eucharist (1 Cor. x. 16 xi. 29) is not satisfied by a purely figurative sense of the above proposition (12).

14. There is room for legitimate difference as to the precise degree or nature of the reality asserted above (12).

15. The language of the Fathers is unstudied and shows variation such as is claimed to be legitimate in the previous proposition.

Sacrificial nature of the Eucharist.

16. Like Baptism the Eucharist has a special reference to the Death of Christ (Rom. vi. 2, 3; 1 Cor. x. 16, xi. 26). In both Sacraments we are so united with Christ that His Death becomes our death, His Merits our righteousness;—the Forgiveness wrought by Him is applied to us.

17. In the Eucharist, especially, we make Christ's Sacrifice our own. The sacrificial character of the Eucharist includes (a) Consecration of the Element as its *conditio sine qua non*, (b) Communion as its instrumental cause.

18. This can probably be extended to those not communicating at the time by the principle of 1 Cor. xii. 26.

19. The first clause of Article XXXI. limits the extent to which the principle of propositions 17, 18 can be rightly applied.

(II) Rev. Canon ROBINSON.

1. Starting from the narrative of the Institution, we observe, first of all, that the Gift offered bears the character of Food. Not only does our Lord take in His Hands typical examples of the food of men, but His first words in reference to them are 'Take, eat,' and 'Drink ye all of this.'

Hence whatever interpretation may be placed upon the subsequent words, 'My Body' and 'My Blood of the Covenant,' it is clear that the Gift offered is intended to be assimilated by the appropriate organs of the recipient, in a way which corresponds to the assimilation of bread and wine by the bodily organs.

2. Now man, in the language of Scripture, is regarded as containing within the animal framework, which is nourished by ordinary food, a higher element of life, which requires an appropriate sustenance. This sustenance, to be appropriate, must be akin to the higher human element, as the food which nourishes the body is akin to the body.

3. Our Lord, in St John's Gospel, offers Himself as the sustenance of this higher element of life in man: 'He that eateth Me, he shall live because of Me'; 'I am the Bread of Life.' In yet more vivid language He speaks of the necessity of 'eating the flesh of the Son of Man, and drinking His blood.' But He warns those who may incline to put a literal interpretation on this utterance, that 'the flesh profiteth nothing,' and that the things of which He has spoken are 'spirit' and 'life.'

It would appear therefore that by 'the flesh and blood of the Son of Man,' as offered for 'eating' and 'drinking,' our Lord intended to signify that the higher human element in Himself, 'the Son of Man,' should be made available for the sustenance of the higher human element in ourselves.

4. This being so, I conceive that in the Eucharist—although our Lord did not use the words 'This is My Flesh,' and 'This is My Blood' (merely), but words in each case of fuller import—

yet this at least is true: namely, that Christ therein offers us Himself, in His perfect and sinless humanity, as the sustenance of the higher human element in ourselves.

5. The actual terms in which the Gift is described in the Words of Institution are of a wider import than might be suggested if we confined ourselves to the Johannine teaching. They left the way open to a larger and a social interpretation, which specially characterises the Pauline doctrine. To St Paul the Word 'This is My Body' (not 'My Flesh') suggested the teaching: 'We, who are many, are one loaf, one Body; because we all partake of the one loaf.' This is his own explanation of his previous statement: 'The loaf which we break, is it not the communion of (*or* a fellowship in) the Body of the Christ?'

Similarly the second Word of Institution, 'This is My Blood of the Covenant,' has for him a suggestion of fellowship. It refers to that New Covenant with a New People, by which the two opposing sections of mankind were brought into a fellowship with God and so with each other. So prominent is this thought in his mind, that in his narrative of the Institution he even reports this second Word in a modified form, and says not 'This is My Blood of the Covenant,' but 'This Cup is the New Covenant in My Blood.'

Accordingly no description of the Gift offered to us in the Eucharist can be complete, which fails to regard it as a means of partaking of that larger Humanity—the One New Man, in whom Christ and His Church are inseparably united.

6. The Johannine and Pauline conceptions find a meeting-point, when we go on to consider the Food offered to us in the Eucharist as Sacrificial Food. Whether or not we supply the word 'given' or 'broken' to the phrase 'My Body which is on your behalf,' a reference is clearly intended to the Crucifixion; and the sacrificial aspect is yet more plainly indicated in the words 'My Blood of the Covenant, which is being poured forth on behalf of many.'

In a sacrifice which included a Sacrificial Meal, a portion was dedicated irrevocably to the Deity, and the remainder was

consumed by the worshippers. Thus the bond between the Deity and his worshippers was knit afresh by means of food taken in common. That some such conception as this was familiar to the minds of St Paul's contemporaries is evident from his references to 'partaking with the altar' in the Jewish ritual, and to 'partaking with demons' in heathen sacrifices (1 Cor. x. 19, 20).

The human life of Christ, offered in Sacrifice to God, and partaken of by us, is the basis of our union with Christ and with God, and also of our union with one another. Accordingly in the Eucharistic Meal the individual worshipper cements his union with Christ (as in the Johannine teaching), and the whole body of worshippers cement their union with that Whole which is Christ and His Body (as in the Pauline teaching). In this completest union we and His whole Church 'obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion.'

7. I have said nothing directly of the 'Sacramental' form in which the gift is offered to us. In the constitution of man's being, so far as we know it here on earth, the boundary-line between the higher and lower elements of its composition cannot be precisely fixed. The two elements perpetually act and re-act on each other. The Sacramental form of the gift appears designed to appeal to the two elements at once, and thus to be especially appropriate to our present earthly condition.

8. In speaking of the humanity of Christ as offered to us as the sustenance of the higher human element in ourselves, I do not forget that His humanity is not separable from His divinity. But the fact of the Incarnation suggests that His divinity would not be, as such, an appropriate sustenance; whereas His humanity would be. And this, I take it, is indicated by the expression 'the flesh and blood of the Son of Man.'

I have endeavoured in the above reply to avoid terms which are commonly debated. I submit what I have written in the full consciousness of the difficulty and danger of attempting even thus much of definition.

(12) Rev. Dr SANDAY.

I may say that I believe in the Real Presence. But I should like to add, as a proviso, the principle stated, I think by Mr Illingworth, and held by some whom I consider to be the best philosophers, that the ultimate test of reality is *relation to persons*. I should be reluctant to describe a Spiritual Presence in terms of space. But I am equally far from regarding it as merely subjective.

It seems to me (as I know that it does to others), that when once the philosophical premiss mentioned above is introduced, the difference that most divides us disappears¹.

(13) Chancellor P. V. SMITH.

I believe that the Divine Gift of Holy Communion is three-fold.

Our Lord has thereby given to those who worthily eat the bread and drink the cup, in accordance with His ordinance, a means—

(1) of renewing to themselves and others the remembrance of His death, and of presenting to God the sacrifice of themselves and of their praise in recollection of the same ;

(2) of renewing communion with Him by spiritually eating His flesh and drinking His blood ; and

(3) of ratifying and confirming their communion with one another.

¹ This appears to be the only part of my personal opinions that is worth stating for the purpose of the Conference. Anything else that I might have said would be on quite ordinary and accepted lines.

(14) The EARL OF STAMFORD.

As regards my belief on the subject of the Divine Gift of Holy Communion, I am and always have been content with the statement of Hooker (*Eccl. Pol.* v. lxvii. 12).

But I should wish there to be in the Church of England, as I believe that there was in the early Church, a large though not unlimited liberty of teaching upon the subject—a subject which, as compared with other controversies of this time, does not appear to me to hold a place in the *primary* rank of importance.

(15) Rev. Dr WACE.

I believe that, at the institution of the Holy Communion, our Lord appointed the Bread which He broke to take the place of the Paschal Lamb, and the Wine to take the place of the Blood of the Covenant, and that He thus established the Christian Passover in place of the Jewish, as a Covenant between God and believers. On God's part, it is a pledge to believers of all the benefits of Christ's passion, and a special means for the conveyance to them of those benefits, including peculiarly that participation of His flesh and blood which is elsewhere declared to be necessary for the possession of eternal life. On man's part, the reception of the consecrated elements of bread and wine is the most solemn pledge of repentance, faith and self-devotion, and is an assured means of receiving the forgiveness of sins, and of partaking of the Saviour's flesh and blood.

In other words, the Holy Communion is a commemoration, as well on the part of God, by whom it was instituted, as on the part of man, of the one sufficient sacrifice offered by our Lord on the cross, and a visible means for assuring and conveying to us the benefits of that sacrifice; while on the part of man it is a Eucharistic sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies.

The following letter from the Rev. Professor SANDAY, D.D., was also submitted to the Conference :—

MY DEAR LORD BISHOP,

I am sending to your Lordship separately a short statement in reply to your invitation. But I should like, if I may, to lay before your Lordship a suggestion, independently of this, as to the way in which we might perhaps work towards an *eirenicon*.

I suppose that we shall be in search of some *common ground* which both the opposing parties may be willing to accept, and by reference to which they may be able to compose some at least of their differences. And I think we shall be agreed that the effect will be far greater, and far more likely to be solid and permanent, if we can succeed in finding a common ground which is no mere expedient devised for the occasion, but a natural outcome of the authentic principles of the English Reformation.

I have asked myself whether there was not one such principle that might answer our purpose, I mean the *Appeal to Antiquity*.

There can be no doubt that this was a leading principle in the English Reformation. Proof can be readily forthcoming, if desired. I think we may go so far as to say that it was *the* principle which on the whole most clearly differentiates the English from the Continental Reformations. Whereas at first the principle seems to have been common to all the reforming movements, on the Continent it seems to have dropped more and more into the background, while in this country it went on strengthening and deepening, until by the time of James I and Charles I it had become distinctive and characteristic.

The question that has occurred to me, and on which I should much like to take the opinion of my colleagues in the Conference, is whether this same principle of the Appeal to Antiquity is not capable of being found helpful at the present time? Could it not with advantage be revived and carried further? The Appeal to Antiquity might be made now with more exactness and with ampler materials. And I would ask whether this ought not to be done?

There are two kinds of use to which the Appeal might be put: (1) theoretic, and (2) practical. And the Appeal itself would wear a different aspect according as one or other of these uses was intended.

For broad arguments of the nature of theory (such, e.g. as those as to the value of Antiquity in the abstract) hard and fast lines would be to be deprecated. But for practical questions (e.g. as to the validity of a particular usage) some definite *terminus ad quem* might be necessary.

If the Conference agreed in thinking this desirable, I would suggest the date 451 A.D. so as to include the period of the first four General Councils. This date appears to commend itself, both as in agreement with good Reformation precedents, and as a more logical halting-place than could easily be found on either side of it.

If this date were thought suitable for what I have called 'practical' purposes, it would also supply a rough indication of what was meant when Antiquity was invoked for purposes of theory.

Perhaps it would be best that for the present the question should be proposed only in a vague and general way. Would the Conference encourage the Appeal to Antiquity, as a possible solution for existing difficulties? Is it desirable that it should be taken as a guiding principle in efforts towards approximation?

That it should be so taken would mean a certain amount of concession on the part of the two wings of the Church that at present stand opposed to each other.

On the Catholic side it would mean some limitation of the appeal that is at present made to that which is claimed as 'Catholic.'

I would submit, however, that after the date 451 A.D. the word 'Catholic' has to be used in an inferior sense. From that date onwards the Christian world came to be so broken up into its several parts that the movement of the whole has practically lost its containing unity. Although the formal separation of

East and West was delayed, the development of each was continued on more and more divergent lines.

After the year 451 it seems to me difficult to collect what could really be called 'Catholic.' And I would suggest that what was lost in extension would be gained in intensity. The word 'Catholic' as applied to the earlier period would have a richer, fuller, and deeper meaning.

On the other hand, if the Protestant party in the Church would accept cordially the Appeal to Antiquity, that too would imply some change at least in the recent action and attitude of some of its members. I would not myself advocate the appeal as a means of bringing coercion to bear on the private practice of anyone. From the first the Church of England, as Reformed, must have contained many good men to whom the Appeal to Antiquity was not really congenial. There are still the spiritual descendants of these men in the Church. And I for one am glad that they are within it. They form a valuable link of connexion with other bodies of our countrymen who are outside. But, while I would have them by all means reserve their own liberty, I would ask if they could not see their way to recognise an equal liberty in others who (on the terms I have mentioned) certainly could not be accused of being untrue to the Reformation?

This is all for which I should myself wish to contend at present. One can foresee possible applications of the Appeal to Antiquity for which perhaps the time is not yet. But if it could go forth from our Conference that the principle involved was recommended to the thoughtful consideration of Churchmen of all parties, I have a good hope that it would be found to have an unifying influence. Different workers, in different ways, would draw near to each other in drawing nearer to a common centre.

I am, my Lord,

Your very faithful servant,

W. SANDAY.

CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD,
Sept. 26, 1900.

FIRST SESSION.

THURSDAY, 11 October; 10.30 a.m.—1 p.m.

The Conference entered on the consideration of the Divine Gift bestowed on us in the Holy Communion.

Canon GORE expressed a hope that before commencing a discussion of points on which the Conference might be divided, its members might accept, as the expression of their unanimous conviction, the statement made by Hooker, in his Ecclesiastical Polity, Book V, chapter 67, § 7, as embodying the common belief of all schools of thought of his day, respecting the blessings conveyed in the Holy Communion. This passage is as follows:—

“It is on all sides plainly confessed, first that this sacrament is a true and a real participation of Christ, who thereby imparteth Himself, even His whole entire Person, as a mystical head unto every soul that receiveth Him, and that every such receiver doth thereby incorporate or unite himself unto Christ as a mystical member of Him, yea of them also whom He acknowledgeth to be His own; secondly, that to whom the person of Christ is thus communicated, to them He giveth by the same sacrament His Holy Spirit to sanctify them as it sanctifieth Him which is their head; thirdly, that what merit, force or virtue soever there is in His sacrificed body and blood, we freely, fully and wholly have it by this sacrament; fourthly, that the effect thereof in us is a real transmutation of our souls and bodies from sin to righteousness, from death and corruption to immortality and life; fifthly, that because the sacrament being of itself but a corruptible and earthly creature

must needs be thought an unlikely instrument to work so admirable effects in man, we are therefore to rest ourselves altogether upon the strength of His glorious power who is able and will bring to pass that the bread and cup which He giveth us shall be truly the thing He promiseth."

Chancellor SMITH observed that the passage, if taken alone, might seem to overlook the continuity of Christian life, as though that life took a fresh beginning from each reception of the Holy Communion; and Canon GORE proposed to obviate this misconception by adding that the passage was to be taken in connexion with the opening sentence of the chapter, § 1, namely,

The grace which we have by the holy Eucharist doth not begin but continue life.

There appeared a general disposition to adopt these passages as expressing the belief of the Conference as a whole; but

Dr BARLOW urged that it might be unwise for the Conference to pledge itself in advance to words which it had not fully considered in detail. It was pointed out by THE CHAIRMAN that unless the passage were unanimously adopted, the object with which it had been put forward would not be attained. It was accordingly suggested by Canon ARMITAGE ROBINSON that the passage might be at least provisionally adopted, with a view to its reconsideration when the Conference came to consider its Report.

This proposal was agreed to.

The Conference then passed to the subject assigned to this Session, taking as the starting-point of their discussion paragraphs VI and VII in Mr DIMOCK's statement, namely:—

VI. *That in the Sacrament, as in the Scriptures (for in the Scriptures also we feed upon the Body and Blood of Christ—*

Tert., Orig., Hieron., &c.), the primary and prominent aspect of the gift is "the remission of sins" (as the immediate result of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ, and as so indicated in the words of Institution). And therefore we may be truly said to feed on "the remission of sins" (Amb. &c.). And that the Res sacramenti is not Christ as He now is, but Christ's Body and Blood as separated in Sacrificial Death for our sins.

VII. *That this primary aspect of the gift is not to be separated from the secondary and resulting view of "all other benefits of His Passion," including the power of His resurrection Life, whereby He is "alive for evermore," and dwells in us and we in Him. That thus we are made partakers of the Crucified Body directly, and of the Glorified Body consequentially. "We eat Christ Crucified in the Sacrament as we partake of the merits of His Death; and if we thus have part in His Crucified Body, we are thereby ipso facto made partakers of His Body glorified." (Waterland.)*

CANON GORE said that it seemed to him difficult to accept the statement adopted from Waterland by Mr Dimock to the effect that we are made "partakers of the crucified body directly and of the glorified body consequentially," and he suggested that it might be more correct even to reverse the order thus stated. He could not conceive of participation of the crucified body except as an act of memory. Whereas, if we were made partakers of the glorified body, we were of course partakers of the body which had been crucified—in the language of the book of the Revelation—of the body of "the Lamb which had been slain."

Professor MOULE urged that it was involved in the terms of Institution that our Lord put forward His body and blood as sacrificed—the body as dead, and the blood as shed—to be participated in as a sacrifice; and that it is through participation in this sacrifice that we are made partakers of the glorified body of our Lord.

Chancellor SMITH suggested that participation of "the glorified body of our Lord" was hardly a correct expression;

and Professor MOULE accepted, as more correct, the statement that "we are made partakers of the glorified Person of our Lord."

Lord HALIFAX agreed that our Lord's body is put forward in the Holy Communion under the aspect of death; but he urged that there is only one body of our Lord—that which is glorified, and that consequently it is of this alone that we can be regarded as partakers.

Canon GORE urged that the Holy Communion is the ordained means by which we realize the blessing promised to us in John vi., and that our Lord must accordingly be understood to point, in the words of Institution, to His ascended and glorified manhood.

Mr DIMOCK considered that the order—as stated—was very important, most important as bearing witness to the truth, that for outcast lost sinners, there was no access to life in communion with God, save by the reconciliation which we have by the death of His Son—no way of entering into fellowship with the resurrection life of Christ except by being made partakers of His Body and Blood, as sacrificed for the remission of sins.

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the fact that our Lord, at the institution of the Eucharist, did not say, "this is my flesh," but "this is my body," and that, bearing in mind what He had said, in St John vi, of eating His flesh and blood, His use of the word "body" instead of flesh must be regarded as most significant, and as indicating the truth that in the Sacrament it is on His body and blood as sacrificed for us that we are to feed by faith. He should be understood to say that the broken bread was henceforth to take the place of the body of the Paschal Lamb, and the wine to take the place of the blood of the covenant. The bread broken and the wine poured out were thus to be henceforth the appointed means for feeding on the sacrifice He offered, and so becoming partakers of all the benefits of that sacrifice.

Chancellor SMITH thought that the words of Institution must at least have reference to our Lord's statements in St John vi; and that, while the reception of the consecrated elements is a means of participating in the sacrifice, it is also a means of partaking of the Saviour's flesh and blood.

Canon ARMITAGE ROBINSON desired to call attention to the passage in which St Paul describes the bread as "the communion of (or a fellowship in) the body of the Christ," together with the words immediately following: "for one bread, one body, we the many are." In regard to the question whether the body was to be considered solely as the body crucified, he himself could not accept such an interpretation of the word *body* in the Eucharist as would make it difficult to pass to the teaching on which St Augustine lays so much stress. He would refer by way of illustration to the words in which St Augustine explained the Pauline doctrine contained in 1 Cor. x. 16, 17: "If therefore *you* are the body of Christ, and members, then the mystery placed on the Lord's Table is the mystery of yourselves; you receive the mystery of yourselves...Be what you see, and receive what you are"¹.

Dr BIGG observed that there seemed little difference in the Conference as to the *Virtus Sacramenti*, that is, as to the benefits of which we are partakers in the Sacrament, but that we differed as to the *Res Sacramenti*—whether it were to be regarded as the crucified, or as the glorified, body of our Lord. This, he thought, involved the question whether the gift of

¹ St Augustine, Sermon. cclxxii (ed. Ben. tom. v, p. 1104): Quomodo est panis corpus ejus? et calix, vel quod habet calix, quomodo est sanguis ejus? Ista, fratres, ideo dicuntur sacramenta, quia in eis aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur; quod videtur speciem habet corporalem, quod intelligitur fructum habet spiritalem. Corpus ergo Christi si vis intelligere, apostolum audi dicentem fidelibus, *Vos autem estis corpus Christi et membra*. Si ergo vos estis corpus Christi et membra, mysterium vestrum in mensa dominica positum est: mysterium vestrum accipitis: ad id quod estis, Amen respondetis, et respondendo rescribitis. Audis enim Corpus Christi, et respondes Amen: esto membrum corporis Christi, ut verum sit Amen. Quare ergo in pane? Nihil hic de nostro afferamus: ipsum apostolum identidem audiamus, qui cum de isto sacramento loqueretur ait: *Unus panis, unum corpus multi sumus*: intelligite et gaudete. Unitas, veritas, pietas, caritas. Unus panis, quis est iste unus panis? Unum corpus multi....Estote quod videtis, et accipite quod estis."

forgiveness of sins was the result of our Lord's passion and death, or whether it was received in consequence of our participation in His life, according to an interpretation sometimes put on the expression : *The blood is the life*.

Dr ROBERTSON suggested that our difference might be indicated by saying that the question is whether the virtue of the Sacrament depends upon our receiving the benefits of Christ's passion (*A*) by commemoration of His death or (*B*) by union with His living body.

Dr MOULE and Canon NEWBOLT concurred.

On the whole, it was recognised that, while in substantial agreement as to the benefits derived from participation in the Holy Communion, the Conference was not able to agree whether or not the words quoted from Waterland, in the last paragraph of Mr Dimock's paper, stated correctly the order and method in which those benefits are received ; some members being disposed to think that in the Holy Communion we are made partakers of the glorified body of our Lord directly, and not merely, as WATERLAND appears to state, consequentially.

SECOND SESSION.

THURSDAY, *October 11* ; 4.15—6.45 p.m.

The Conference proceeded to consider the relation between the Divine Gift in the Holy Communion and the consecrated elements ; and again took as their starting-point the statement of Mr Dimock, particularly in paragraphs I—III, namely :—

I. *That, in consecration, a change is effected as regards the elements, which may be called a Divine Change, a change which could only be effected by the “omnipotency of Christ’s Word,” a change of use, not of substance, nor of nature—grace being added to nature.*

II. *That in use, the consecrated elements are effectual signs for the purpose of the ordinance, seals of donation, and so truly “exhibitive” proxies of the THINGS signified, whose Names they bear in the delivery—Which are thus verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful, being really present for the manducation of faith—“Cui præsentia sunt omnia præterita” [Rupert. Tuit.].*

III. *That this Real Presence may be truly called an “Objective Presence,” because faith is not imagination, and faith believes only what is really and objectively true, and takes and receives only what is truly and objectively offered. But is not a Presence in or under the Elements “considered in themselves”—though the negation of the trans, con, sub, in, &c., viewed simply as modes of the Presence, does not belong to that which is de fide.*

Canon GORE asked Mr Dimock in what sense he regarded the "omnipotency of Christ's Word" as requisite for "a change of use" in the elements.

Mr DIMOCK replied that he meant it was necessary for such a use as was provided in the Sacrament; that is to say, an effectual use, by which the elements become operative "seals of donation." The words in his statement, *omnipotency of Christ's Word*, were taken from Bishop Ridley.

In reply to Dr BARLOW, Mr DIMOCK said it would be in harmony with his views to supplement the words at the end of paragraph I, "grace being added to nature," by the words "for the purpose of such use."

Mr DIMOCK was also asked by the CHAIRMAN what he intended, in paragraph II, by "the things signified" by the elements; and he replied that he referred to the past sacrifice, and meant the Body and Blood of Christ in a sacrificial state; so that our Lord is to be understood to say, "This is my Body and my Blood for the purpose of your participation in my sacrifice."

A question being raised by Canon GORE respecting the quotation from Rupert of Deutz in Mr Dimock's statement, the whole passage was read by Mr Dimock, as follows:—

Totus adest, totus sancto incumbit altari, non ut iterum patiat, sed ut fidei, cui præsentia sunt omnia præterita, ejus passio memoriter repræsenteretur (de Trin. lib. xlii).

Upon this Canon GORE remarked that it seemed excellently to express the view for which he had been contending: the Christ present on the altar, according to Rupert, was the whole Christ, that is the living Christ. But faith contemplated Him under a past aspect, as dying.

Mr DIMOCK held that the words quoted in his statement were sufficient and good for his purpose, which was simply to show that there was no novelty in maintaining that things of the *past* may be things *present to faith*.

Dr ROBERTSON then referred to the expression in Lord Halifax's paper respecting the Body of Christ, "mystically represented under the aspect of death," and asked whether this expression might be regarded as equivalent to Mr Dimock's language.

Dr MOULE said that in his view the matter might be represented in the following manner: that, if our eyes could be opened, we should see our Lord, not on, but at, the Holy Table, taking the consecrated bread and wine, and giving them to us. Christ is thus present, giving Himself under a past aspect, and directing our minds to that aspect as the primary thought. He presides over the feast, and is the supreme Minister of it. He lives to bless us through it; and the Saviour in His living glory is there. But what He gives us is τὸ σῶμα—we must not shrink from the meaning—His body as dead.

Mr DIMOCK observed that the latter phrase is equivalent to that of Bishop Andrewes (*Sermons*, vol. II, p. 302, A. C. L.) *ad cadaver*¹.

Canon GORE said that he hoped Dr MOULE adhered to the expression he had himself welcomed in a former utterance: that our Lord is present, saying, This is my body, and this is my blood, and he gratefully acknowledged what he had learned from Dr Moule's published writings on the subject of our real incorporation with Christ. But he could not but submit that he found an insuperable difficulty in speaking of two distinct bodies of our Lord, a crucified and a glorified one. He could not separate the sacrificed from the glorified body of our Saviour, and could not conceive of our partaking of the former except

¹ The entire passage is as follows:—We are in this action not only carried up to Christ (*Sursum corda*), but we are also carried back to Christ as He was at the very instant and in the very act of His offering. So, and no otherwise, doth this text teach. So, and no otherwise, do we represent Him. By the incomprehensible power of His Holy Spirit, not He alone, but He as at the very act of His offering is made present to us, and we incorporate into His death, and invested in the benefits of it. If an Host could be turned into Him now glorified as He is, it would not serve; Christ offered is it—thither we must look. To the Serpent lift up, thither we must repair, even *ad cadaver*. (Sermon on 1 Cor. v, 7, 8, vol. II, pp. 301, 302.)

through the latter. The latter, he urged, is the only body now existing, or that ever has existed; and it is the same body which, once in a crucified, is now in a glorified state.

The CHAIRMAN said that, recognizing the force of that observation, he wished to meet it directly, by observing that it was precisely in order to meet the difficulty in question that our Saviour appointed the broken bread and the poured out wine to be the Sacrament of His crucified body and blood—that is, to be to all practical intents and purposes the body which was crucified and the blood which was shed. By virtue of the Sacrament, that crucified body is made present with us for the purpose of our participation in its sacrifice. It is those who are of this opinion who are most concerned to deny, and who most earnestly deny, that the Sacrament is a mere commemoration, in the sense suggested by Canon Gore. They regard it as the effectual presentation to us of the Body once sacrificed, and the effectual participation on our part of the sacrifice which it constituted.

Dr ROBERTSON said he felt it desirable to include the feeding both on the crucified and on the glorified body of Christ in the idea of the eucharistic gift. In separating the two, as mutually exclusive alternatives, were we not applying too rigorously the category of time to what does not properly belong to time? True, the Cross is a historical event in time, and the aboriginal Christian instinct, by word, gesture, and symbol, marks our religion as the religion of the Cross. But the Lamb was not only now “as slain,” *ἐσφαγμένον*, eternally in heaven, but was also slain from the foundation of the world—eternally slain both *a parte ante*, and *a parte post*. Secondly, he could not dissociate St Paul’s characteristic thought of Christ as Head of a living body from his eucharistic *κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος*. The correlation between the two seemed to postulate communion with a living body. But still, by placing the cup and the blood first in 1 Cor. x. 16, St Paul emphasizes the aspect of the eucharist as a feast on the sacrificial death of Christ.

Professor BEVAN suggested that the two thoughts might be combined in the consideration that the blood is the symbol both of death and of life.

Chancellor SMITH, in reference to the objection that the view of Mr Dimock and others created an antithesis between the crucified and glorified body of our Lord, observed that such an antithesis was inevitable, and was actually exhibited in the original institution. Our Lord, at that institution, in His living body, gave to His disciples that which He described as His body which was broken and as His blood which was shed. An antithesis similar to that to which exception is taken was there exhibited in fact by our Lord Himself.

Dr BIGG called attention to the forms of expression on the subject in the ancient Liturgies, observing that there might be said to be three classes of expression on the subject. First, in the Egyptian Church Order, in the Æthiopic Liturgy, and in the Nestorian Liturgies the invocation is a prayer that the Holy Ghost might be sent down upon "the sacrifice of this Christian Church," or it is simply a prayer that He would bless and sanctify the gifts of the Church; in the second case, the prayer is that He will ἀποφαίνειν, or ἀναδεῖξαι, the elements to be the precious body of the Lord. In the third case, we find the word ποιεῖν used, that He may make the bread and wine to be the precious body and blood. In Chrysostom's liturgy the word μεταβαλὼν is used, and this was interpolated at an early date in the liturgy of Basil, but erased again by the Synod of Laodicea¹. He was disposed to think that the further we went back, the simpler and the more free from definition was the language of consecration. Such a review of the variety of language employed on the subject seemed to point to the greatness of the mystery, and to the consequent danger of laying stress on particular expressions and definitions.

Canon GORE doubted whether the variation in language to which attention was called by Dr Bigg could be regarded as a progression from early to late forms of language. He thought much evidence had been adduced, as for instance by Duchesne, to show that the earlier language of the Liturgies was in some cases, at all events, the more definite in its assertion of a change in the consecrated elements. He also remarked that a law of

¹ Cf. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, p. 406; text and note.

relativity as between 'object' and 'subject' may be observed in the language of the Church on the Eucharistic presence, which corresponds to a general law of a similar character in respect to the presence of natural objects. All presence is, in an important sense, merely a presence to our faculties, and cannot be predicated in absolute terms. So the spiritual presence in the Eucharist is a presence relative to the faith of the Church. He referred, in illustration, to Mozley's *Lectures and Theological Papers*, p. 202.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether such a metaphysical consideration of the matter would practically make much difference in the controversy. The question at issue is not what presence means in the abstract, but whether the presence alleged in the Holy Communion is a presence as local, at all events, as ordinary presence.

Dr BIGG asked whether it was maintained that the change in the consecrated elements was more than a change of use.

Lord HALIFAX said that he acknowledged there was no physical change, but that to faith the elements become the Body and Blood of our Lord.

The question was much pressed what was the real meaning of the phrase used by Lord HALIFAX in his Statement that the elements are "sacramentally identified" with the Body and Blood of our Lord.

Lord HALIFAX asked whether the CHAIRMAN had not used this expression in an address at Islington.

The CHAIRMAN, without repudiating the phrase, observed that it was an ambiguous one, and that the question it involved was not only what the word "sacramentally" meant, but what was the nature of the body and blood with which the identification, or—to use perhaps a better word—the equivalence was asserted.

The CHAIRMAN observed that it would appear from the printed statements of belief that views were held by many persons respecting the relation of the presence to the elements

which had not yet been clearly put forward in the discussion ; and he appealed to any members of the Conference who held such views to put them forward, as the very object of the Conference was to obtain a clear statement of differing views.

Lord HALIFAX said he thought he had intimated his views sufficiently throughout the discussion, and referred the Conference to his Paper. He wished to be understood as stating simply that the bread and wine became the Body and Blood of our Lord.

Canon NEWBOLT similarly referred to the language of his Paper, in which he had explained that while the elements of bread and wine retain their natural substances, an addition is made to them, by virtue of which the Body and Blood of Christ "are present really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably, under the outward visible sign or form of bread and wine."

Canon GORE pointed out that in the early Fathers there was, as Harnack had observed, a use of 'symbol' somewhat unlike our own. "What we nowadays understand by symbol is a thing which is not that which it represents ; at that time (i.e. the early Christian centuries) symbol denoted a thing which, in some kind of way, really is what it signifies. But on the other hand, according to the ideas of the period, the really heavenly element lay either in or behind the visible form, without being identical with it. Accordingly the *distinction* of a symbolic from a realistic conception of the Supper is altogether to be rejected¹."

Mr DIMOCK did not question that the elements were regarded as effectual symbols of the reality which they represented. But he could not allow that this brought to naught the argument against the Real Presence in the elements from the habitual use in early ages of such terms as *Figure*, *Type*, *Image*, *Symbol*, *Likeness*, etc. He drew attention to the fact that when an important step forwards had been made in Eucharistic doctrine after the teaching of Joannes Damascenus (though still very far indeed from what is now commonly called the Real

¹ Harnack : *Hist. of Dogma*. Eng. Trans. ii. p. 144.

Presence), the 2nd Council of Nicæa pronounced the view conveyed by such expressions as coming from the delirium of madness, denied that the Fathers had used such language aforetime, except as applied to the unconsecrated elements, and affirmed that such expressions cannot be reconciled with the truth of the Eucharist¹.

Dr MOULE recalled the phrase of Ratramnus, “non in veritate sed in figurâ,” and that Ratramnus appealed to previous patristic teaching as wholly with him in his protest against the “corporal presence” taught by Paschasius, and which had surprised the King of France.

Professor BEVAN quoted to the Conference, as illustrating the point at issue, the following observations by the Rev. A. W. Hutton, Rector of Easthope, Shropshire, who had left the priesthood of the Church of Rome for that of the Church of England :

“I, who in the years 1879—1883 have said Mass according to the Roman rite over 1000 times, and who now hold that no change in the elements takes place, could still, I think, say Mass according to that rite with spiritual profit and devotion. As I now understand the matter, it is not so much the *making* of the Presence, as the *recognition* of it that the Mass teaches. At the Mass (even when there is only a priest and a server) *two* at any rate are ‘gathered together’ in the Name of Christ, and there He is in the midst of them. His Presence is indeed everywhere as God ; it is realised as the Presence of Christ, God and man, in the sacred rite ; and it is focussed (so to speak) for our recognition and adoration in the bread and wine. The bread and the wine are in no way changed ; but our mental attitude towards them is changed. We ‘discern the Lord’s body’ there, because we realise, at this time, and in connection with our use of these Christ-instituted and Church-ordained elements, a truth that is ineffective when accepted generally, viz. that God Himself underlies all phenomena, and is the one true and

¹ Especially observable are the following words of the Council:—*Εἰ εἰκὼν τοῦ σώματος ἐστὶ, οὐκ ἐνδέχεται εἶναι αὐτὸ τὸ θεῖον σῶμα.* *Labbæus*, Tom. vii, c. 449.

eternal Substance. There is thus no question of *transubstantiation* or of *consubstantiation*, or of any miraculous change, but of a presence that is objective, whether we will or no, and also subjective, because it affects us only in so far as we realise it by faith. And the priest who performs the rite, and who elevates the Host for the adoration of the faithful, does this as their minister and representative.

"There is no idolatry, for no one dreams of worshipping the bread and the wine, in so far as they can be seen, handled, and tasted ; but they form what I have called the *focus* for the adoration of Christ, who is present as the reward of faith. Both the Greek Liturgies (in which, at the *offertory*, worship is directed towards the elements, in consideration of the high office for which they have been set apart), and the Roman Mass (in which the Host and the chalice are blessed by the priest *after the words of consecration have been said*), are witnesses against the idea that, at one particular moment, a miraculous and permanent change is effected in the elements by the action of the priest ; and I believe that this other notion of the Presence, here imperfectly elucidated, though it may be neither new nor original, contains a really unifying thought for those whom the Protestant and Catholic theories at present divide into two camps.

"Certainly it is quite consistent with all that is to be found in the Prayer Book ; while it is also consistent with the use of Catholic ceremonial, the attractive power of which it is unreasonable not to acknowledge. Most of all it is consistent (so at least it seems to me) with a spiritual conception of Christianity and of worship."

Lord HALIFAX was asked whether the expression in paragraph 2 of his Paper, that "the bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of our Lord," was to be understood as equivalent to the statement in his fifth paragraph, that the separated symbols of bread and wine are "sacramentally identified with His Body and Blood," and whether he felt it necessary to adhere to the expression "changed into," which seemed to go beyond the expression "made."

Lord HALIFAX said that, in his meaning, the two sets of expressions were equivalent ; but he thought the expressions in his second paragraph could not be surrendered without repudiating language frequently and habitually used by the Fathers, and thus placing ourselves out of harmony with antiquity.

The CHAIRMAN acknowledged that the expressions in question could not well be absolutely repudiated without repudiating much ancient language ; but it was a question whether it was anciently used in the sense intended by Lord Halifax, as more particularly explained in his fifth paragraph, in which he speaks of "the actual presence, under the sacramental forms, the outward and visible signs, of Him who was incarnate in the womb of the Blessed Virgin," &c. These words seemed equivalent to Canon Newbolt's assertion that "the Body and Blood of Christ are present really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably, under the outward visible part, sign or form, of bread and wine," and to the belief thus indicated he was obliged to offer an unqualified denial. For the reason already stated he did not consider that any such belief was inculcated in our Lord's words of institution, which seemed to refer entirely to His body and blood as sacrificed, and not to His body and blood as now glorified.

Canon GORE thought it must be admitted that the words of institution would prove very difficult of interpretation if considered by themselves—if, for instance, it had only become known by some recent discovery that they had been used by our Lord. The key to their interpretation was, he thought, only to be found in the belief and teaching of the historical society by which they had been handed down.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the belief put forward by Lord Halifax and Canon Newbolt could only be founded on our Lord's words of institution, and it was admitted by Lord Halifax in his statement, that each Eucharist is a repetition of what our Lord did in the Last Supper. Now when our Lord uttered the words of institution, and gave the bread and wine

to His disciples, He was sitting before them in His human body. Did Canon Newbolt then mean that in the bread and wine which our Lord distributed His Body and Blood were present spiritually and ineffably, under the outward visible sign?

Canon NEWBOLT replied that such was his belief.

Dr ROBERTSON was disposed to think the Chairman's question was not capable of quite so categorical an answer. St Augustine said (Enarr. in Psalm. xxxiii. ii, 2) that our Lord "*Ipse se portabat quodam modo cum diceret Hoc est Corpus Meum.*"

The CHAIRMAN observed that the discussion seemed to have led to the recognition of a distinct divergence of belief, beyond which it could not well be pushed in the present Conference. The Conference appeared, as in the previous Session, to be in general agreement as to the benefits received by participation in the Holy Communion, but to differ decidedly as to the relation of the consecrated elements to those benefits. It appeared to be generally recognized in the Conference that this was the result which had been arrived at, and the discussion of this branch of the subject was then closed.

THIRD SESSION.

FRIDAY, *October* 12. 10.30—1.

THE Chairman read his minutes of the two Sessions of the previous day, which were amended in some particulars, and generally approved.

The Conference then entered on the consideration of the Sacrificial aspect of the Holy Communion, starting from the consideration of the fourth paragraph of Mr Dimock's statement ; namely :—

“ That though not the purpose of the Ordinance, there may be truly said to be an Offering, i.e. to the Divine view, of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ, or of Christ Himself, in representation, not re-representation, symbolically, not hypostatically, offered to view—not as making, but as having made once for all the perfect propitiation for the sins of the world.”

Canon GORE intimated that he felt much hesitation in accepting the opening words of this statement, that the offering to the divine view of the sacrifice of the death of Christ was not *the* purpose of the ordinance. He thought that the commemoration of that sacrifice before God as well as man must be recognized as at least one of its purposes.

The CHAIRMAN intimated a similar difficulty, as he was disposed to regard such a commemoration, before both God and man, as the primary purpose of the ordinance. The main difference of view arose, to his mind, in respect to the means by which that commemoration is made—whether by means of the

bread broken and the wine poured out, as sacramental symbols, by means of which we are made partakers of the Saviour's sacrifice and of all its benefits; or whether by means of the actual presence of our Lord's body and blood under the outward and visible signs.

Lord HALIFAX said that what he intended to express in his statement on this point was that the bread and wine, sacramentally identified with our Lord's Body and Blood, are offered in commemoration of all our Lord suffered. The Eucharistic sacrifice depends upon a valid consecration, by means of which the Body and Blood of Christ, mystically represented under the aspect of death, are sacramentally offered to the Father. We thus make in *act* the same commemoration of our Lord's sacrifice which we do in *word* when we pray "through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Canon GORE desired to urge two points. A. That it may be emphatically stated that, down to the time of St Thomas Aquinas inclusive, the memorial of our Lord's death made in the Holy Communion is regarded as commemorative only, and is not connected with any idea of actual immolation. B. That it would be generally agreed that that which differentiates our relation to the sacrifice of Christ as commemorated in the Holy Communion from our relation to that sacrifice on any other occasion, when we might agree to commemorate His death, is the fact that this sacrament is the ordained occasion on which our Lord gives us His body and blood, sacramentally identified with the bread and wine; so that in some sense that which differentiates this commemoration from any other is the fact of the special relation in which, by our Lord's ordinance, we are placed towards those realities.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether this did not amount to saying that this commemoration of the Sacrifice is also a Communion.

Canon GORE did not, however, accept this expression of his view, as he wished it borne in mind that some persons regard the climax of the sacrifice as consisting in the consecration,

while others regard it as consisting in the reception of the elements.

In reply to a question from Dr BARLOW, Mr DIMOCK explained his meaning by reference to Waterland's distinction between sacrifice actively and passively considered. "Christ's sacrifice is *our sacrifice*, but in the *passive* sense, for us to *partake* of, not to *give*, unto God." (*Distinctions of Sacrifice*, § II, Works, vol. v; p. 235. Oxford, 1843.) He further explained the expression "offering to view" as distinguished from *sacri-ficial oblation* (properly so called) somewhat as the shewing of a receipt for a debt paid is to be distinguished from the paying of the debt. (See Waterland, vol. v, p. 129, note, and p. 183.) He had failed to find any sufficient Scriptural warrant for regarding any offering to God as being strictly *the* purpose of the ordinance.

It was then agreed, as an amendment to Mr Dimock's statement, to omit the words "though not *the* purpose," and to substitute the words "as one aspect."

The discussion then turned to the nature of the offering made in the Holy Communion

Canon GORE observed that, in New Testament language, all our prayers are offered *ἐν Χριστῷ*, that is, by virtue of our incorporation in Him.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the preposition *ἐν* had also an instrumental sense.

Canon NEWBOLT drew attention to the fact that no one asserted more strongly than Mr Keble himself, in his *Eucharistical Adoration*, that Christ is the real Consecrator in every Eucharist.

Dr BARLOW having intimated his hesitation in accepting the statement that in the Eucharist there is "an offering to the Divine view" of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, Lord HALIFAX recalled the words of the Prayer of Consecration in the

Prayer Book, which formally commemorate before God the fact that He gave His "Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there (by His one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice."

Dr BIGG asked what are the passages in the New Testament in which any such commemoration before God is prescribed. Is it involved, for instance, in the word *ἀνάμνησις*? It can hardly be read into St Paul's word *καταγγέλλετε*.

Dr MOULE thought we had no warrant in Scripture for the supposed offering of the bread and wine to the Divine view. Scripture, he urged, is our only authority on the subject, and it does not seem revealed to us there that we should do this, that, or the other thing, as to God; but that the sacred gifts are given by God to us, not offered from us to Him.

Chancellor SMITH urged that the commemoration of a sacrifice cannot properly be called a sacrifice.

Dr ROBERTSON drew attention to the early use of sacrificial terms in the primitive Church, which he thought arose inevitably from the connexion of the Eucharist with the Passover, which was a sacrificial meal, the expression *θύειν τὸ πᾶσχα* being used by St Mark (xiv. 12) and St Luke (xxii. 7), and *θύειν* being a sacrificial word. But he thought that if we got to the real mind of early Christian writers in the use of such language, their idea is always that of a retrospective reference to the sacrifice on the Cross, and he quoted passages from St Chrysostom (*Hom. in Hebr.* xvii) and St Augustine (*c. Faust.* xx, 18) in which this view is expressed in almost identical terms.

Lord HALIFAX then asked for an explanation of the expression in Mr DIMOCK's statement that the Offering is made "symbolically, not hypostatically," and Mr DIMOCK explained that the word "hypostatically" was taken from Bishop Bull, who uses it in describing our difference from the Church of Rome, saying that "In the Eucharist Christ is offered, not hypostatically, as the Trent Fathers have determined (for so He was but once offered) but commemoratively only¹."

¹ The following is the passage from which the quotation is made :—"This

After some further discussion of various phrases in the clause, it was agreed, on Dr BARLOW'S motion, to substitute for the words "an offering" the words "a submitting," the latter being a neutral form of expression.

On Dr ROBERTSON'S suggestion it was also agreed to omit the words "or of Christ Himself." It was also agreed to omit the words "symbolically, not hypostatically," with a view to this qualification being considered in a distinct clause.

Mr DIMOCK'S fourth paragraph, as thus amended, read as follows :—

"That, as one aspect of the ordinance, there may be truly said to be a submitting to the Divine view of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ, in representation, not re-presentation, not as making, but as having made once for all the perfect propitiation for the sins of the world."

In this form the clause received the assent of all members of the Conference, except that the words "*in representation not re-presentation*" were hardly discussed

proposition [That in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead] having that other of the substantial presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist immediately annexed to it, the meaning of it must necessarily be this: that in the Eucharist the very Body and Blood of Christ are again offered up to God as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of men. Which is an impious proposition, derogatory to the one full satisfaction of Christ made by His death on the Cross, and contrary to express Scripture.....In the Eucharist, then, Christ is offered not hypostatically as the Trent Fathers have determined (for so He was but once offered) but commemoratively only: and this commemoration is made to God the Father, and is not a bare remembering, or putting ourselves in mind of Him." (Bp Bull, *Corruptions of the Church of Rome*: Lect. iii, § 2: Works, Vol. ii, pp. 251, 252; Oxford, 1846.)

Again: "In the Holy Eucharist, therefore, we set before God the Bread and Wine, as figures or images of the precious blood of Christ, shed for us and of His precious Body (they are the very words of the Clementine Liturgy) and plead to God the merit of His Son's Sacrifice once offered on the Cross for sinners, and in this Sacrament represented" (Ibid. p. 292).

at this stage, and it subsequently appeared that the assent of all members did not extend to them.

In reference to the qualifying phrase which had been postponed,

Dr ROBERTSON observed that there are three ways in which the actual presence of our Lord in the Sacrament might be considered, namely :—

A. That it was primarily for the purpose of feeding on Him by faith ; or

B. For the purpose of offering Him as a sacrifice to the Father ; or

C. That the primary purpose is to continue life in the whole body of members of Christ, and to convey to them the benefits of Christ's passion, so that by Communion the Church appropriates the sacrifice of Christ.

For himself he would desire to adopt the third of these views.

At the CHAIRMAN'S suggestion, Dr ROBERTSON expressed his willingness to omit the introductory words of his proposal, which speak of the primary purpose of the ordinance, as the Conference had already discussed that point without being able to come to an agreement.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the qualifying words desired might be in some such form as the following : That the means of this representation of the death of Christ is a symbolical, and not hypostatical, identification of the elements with the Body and Blood of our Lord.

Canon GORE observed that the term *hypostatical* was almost confined, in the language of theology, to the union of the two natures in our Lord's person, and that the union of the Body and Blood with the elements was in Roman theology expressly stated to be not hypostatical.

Mr BIRKBECK observed that the use of the word in the latter sense had been formally condemned at the Synod of Bethlehem as being a Lutheran error.

Mr DIMOCK mentioned that the term had been used by Roman Catholic controversialists to express what they regarded as the error of Lutheranism on this subject. He also urged that there was a lack of evidence of any offering of the sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharist before the third century, and that the earlier view does not appear to have risen above the idea of offering the elements for consecration.

Canon GORE observed that the implied antithesis to *symbolical* is *real*; and the CHAIRMAN said that it would answer the purpose he had in view to adopt, in place of "hypostatical," in the clause he had suggested, the word "actual," used by Lord Halifax in his fifth paragraph.

Canon GORE then said there was no subject on which similarity of phrase had covered more difference of meaning than that of the eucharistic sacrifice. The supposition that there is any re-sacrificing of Christ might at once be excluded; but when we proceed beyond that point, there have been and still are great differences as to the sense in which the eucharist is regarded as a sacrifice. More particularly,

A. He agreed with Mr Dimock that in the sense in which the early Christians used the word, as, for example, in Irenæus, the main stress was laid on the material elements. The sacrifices of the Church are regarded as offered for the acceptance of God. The thought in the mind of Irenæus is that they were offered for acceptance at the heavenly altar. Then in response to the invocation of the Holy Spirit they were consecrated to be our Lord's body and blood; and the consecration was regarded as the acceptance of the Church's sacrifice at the heavenly altar, in virtue of which the elements were returned to the Church as the body and blood of our Lord. This, he thought, was the view primarily represented in the Liturgies—our gifts go up to heaven, and receive an identification with Christ's priestly offering.

B. There is a view characteristic of Eastern teaching, and represented by Cyril of Jerusalem, according to which the consecration is specially regarded as a consecration of the bread

and wine to be on the altar the body and blood of Christ: which makes a special presence of Christ's everlasting sacrifice, bringing it, as it were, into the midst of the Church. There is thus a special presence after consecration of the heavenly sacrifice in the midst of the worshipping Church; and this leads either to the postponement of the Intercession, which formerly came before the Canon, or to its being repeated after consecration.

C. There is the view that by means of Communion the real connection of the Church with the sacrifice of Christ is substantiated or maintained. In St Augustine this view became dominant. Though he speaks also of the offering of Christ or of the passion of Christ, yet he lays the main stress on the offering of the Church in Christ.

The consideration to which this review of this subject points would seem to be that we should not attempt to define too strictly a subject on which there had been such a variety of apprehension.

The CHAIRMAN, on the part of the members of the Conference, expressed their obligation to Canon Gore for his interesting and instructive contribution to the history of this subject, but submitted that it left them still in presence of the difficulty of stating what was the relation of the consecrated elements to the Eucharistic sacrifice; and he submitted that it was essential with a view to the coming discussion on Ritual, which involved that of adoration, to mark the difference of view entertained by members of the Conference with respect to the presence in the elements. As Dr Bigg said, it was agreed by all that there was no physical change in the elements; but there the agreement seemed to stop, and it seemed a vital question whether the sacrifice, however understood, depended upon some other change in the elements, such as Lord Halifax and Canon Newbolt seemed to imply, or only upon a change in their use.

The time had come for closing the discussion, but he asked leave to mention two points, First, that the view attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem and other Fathers by Dr Gifford, in his Preface to the translation of the Catechetical Lectures in the

series of Post Nicene Fathers (pp. xxxv—xl), had not been adequately noticed, according to which there is a union between the Divine Logos and the consecrated elements. Secondly, that in any discussion of the question of the Eucharistic sacrifice, careful attention is due to the contention of Dean Field, one of the most authoritative of English Divines in the period which summed up the controversies of the 16th century, that the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass, as taught by the Council of Trent, is not involved in the canon of the mass, and was not held by the best Divines of the Western Church before that Council. "It appeareth," says Dean Field, "by that which hath been said, that neither the Canon of the Mass, rightly understood, includeth in it any such points of Romish religion as some imagine; but in sundry, yea in all the capital differences between us and them of the Roman faction, witnesseth for us, and against them; and that the prelates and guides of the Church formerly made no such construction of it as now is made. That it may have a good sense, our men confess. I could, saith Luther, make such a construction of the canon of the mass as might stand with the rule of faith; and I have somewhere so done: but seeing it is obscure, and the rule of the lawyers is, that he that will speak obscurely shall have his words construed against him, and not for him; I will not, saith he, take so much pains, as to seek out and declare the best meaning that may be conceived of it, but a better form being found out, will leave this and embrace that. That it is obscure I," says Field, "shewed out of Cassander, and that if it is to be retained it must have some scholies, or explications, either added in the margent, or inserted into the text, that it may be understood and rightly used; which thing if it be done, it will seem a new one; and if it should have such explications as he would have, it will differ little or nothing from our liturgy." (Field, *Of the Church*: Cambridge, 1849; vol. ii., pp. 94—95.)

Dean Field's meaning, and the nature of the obscurities to which he refers, are further explained in the important passage which follows (p. 96):—"The canon of the mass rightly understood is found to contain nothing in it contrary to the rule of

faith, and the profession of the protestant Churches; the abuses of private masses and half communions are found to have been beside, and against the words and meaning of them that composed the canon, and not without the dislike of many good men, before and since Luther's time; and the construction that they now make of the word 'sacrifice,' so often used in it, appeareth to be a mere perverting of the meaning of the canon to a sinister sense, never intended of the authors of it, nor ever allowed by the best men in the Church. This canon, notwithstanding is found to have some passages, that, in the judgment of men right learned, cannot well have any true meaning, unless the old custom of offering bread and wine on the Lord's table, out of which the sacrament may be consecrated, be restored; so that those parts, that custom being discontinued, may well be omitted. Some other parts are obscure and need explication; which being added, or inserted, it will differ little or nothing from those forms of consecration of those holy mysteries that are now in use in the reformed Churches of England, and some other places, therefore brought in, because in later ages many things were added to the canon anciently in use, which the best and gravest in the Church thought fit to be taken away, and a new form of divine service to be composed. So that the Church that formerly was, having no different judgment touching matters dogmatical, no liking of those abuses in practice which some had brought in, and wishing things to be brought to such a course as Protestants now have brought them; it may well be said to have been a protestant Church, in such sort as I formerly showed."

Lord HALIFAX said he had drawn up a statement which he hoped might afford a basis for agreement among Members of the Conference in reference to the points which had hitherto been under discussion; and this statement was accordingly read as follows:—

"That the bread and wine, by virtue of our Lord's institution, become sacramentally the Body and Blood of Christ.

"That this change is sacramental, in a sphere outside the cognizance of sense, to be accepted and therefore to be apprehended

only by faith,—i.e., that to the eye of faith, since ‘faith is not imagination, but believes only what is objectively true,’ the bread and wine are the Body and Blood of Christ, but that in the natural order they remain what they were before.

“ That expressed devotionally, in the words of Professor Moule, ‘ I see in the Holy Eucharist, which is primarily and before all things the memorial of the Lord’s death, Christ my Lord at the Holy table, coming to me and saying: This is my Body which was broken for you, this is my Blood which was shed for you’—or, as was expressed by Canon Gore, Canon Newbolt, and Lord Halifax, ‘ That in every Eucharist Christ is the real consecrator,’ who in the service which He has instituted for the perpetual memory of His death gives to His faithful people His Body as broken, His Blood as poured out, mystically represented and exhibited under the aspect of death by the separate consecration of the bread and wine.

“ That Christ is present in the Holy Eucharist not in a corporal or natural manner, not locally as if He descended from heaven upon our altars, but sacramentally only, spiritually, after the manner of a spirit.”

This statement seemed to be favourably viewed by some members of the Conference, but hesitation was intimated by others, and after some conversation it was felt to be impracticable to form a just opinion upon it without more mature consideration than was possible at the end of a Session. It was therefore agreed to resume its discussion at the commencement of the afternoon’s Session, before entering on the remaining question referred to the Conference by the Bishop, that of Ritual. The Conference then adjourned.

FOURTH SESSION.

FRIDAY, *October* 12 ; 4.15—6.45.

The Chairman's Minutes of the previous Session were read and approved, with some amendments.

The Conference then continued the discussion which had occupied the morning Session by taking into further consideration the statement which had been submitted by Lord Halifax ; and as Mr Dimock was obliged to leave in the course of the afternoon, he was invited by the Chairman to state his opinion respecting it.

He observed that the first clause might be accepted provided it were explained that the bread and wine do not become really the Body and Blood of Christ, and are not changed in substance but only in use. The concluding words of the third clause seemed to him a dangerous approximation to the language of the Roman Church on the subject. The final clause he regarded as amounting to a statement that a material body is present in a spiritual manner, and as thus involving what Bishop Cosin regards as an absurdity, in accordance with the statement of Bp Jeremy Taylor, that the Roman view "makes His Body to be present no way but that which is impossible and implies a contradiction, a body not after the manner of a body, a body like a spirit; a body without a body"; whereas the true meaning of "spiritual presence" is presence "to our spirits only"¹.

¹ The following are the passages to which reference is intended :—

"Where now is the difference? Here; by 'spiritually' they mean 'present after the manner of a spirit'; by 'spiritually' we mean 'present to our spirits only'; that is, so as Christ is not present to any other sense but that of faith, or spiritual susception; but their way makes His body to be present no way but that which is impossible and

Dr SANDAY observed that he could well understand that Mr Dimock could not adopt Lord Halifax's statement as his own, but he wished to ask Mr Dimock whether he thought the expressions of that statement other than compatible with loyalty to the teaching of the Church of England.

Mr DIMOCK replied by calling attention to the fact that the Church of England had with great care—evidently *ex industria*—perhaps even with excess of caution—but certainly with a settled purpose—eliminated from her formularies the language which might seem to support or to warrant the teaching of the Real Presence as sacramentally identified with the consecrated elements. And he further expressed his conviction that our Article XXIX afforded a crucial test in answer to the enquiry as to whether this doctrine was the doctrine of the English Church. He contended that this Article, viewed in relation to the mediaeval speculations which led up to the Trent Canons of 1551, and still more viewed in relation to the movements on the Continent between the Lutherans and the Reformed, and perhaps, still more, viewed in relation to the history of its insertion among our Articles, gave unmistakable evidence of the Church of England having taken her stand clearly and strongly on one side of a doctrinal gulf, on the

implies a contradiction; a body not after the manner of a body, a body like a spirit; a body without a body; and a sacrifice of body and blood without blood; Corpus incorporeum, Cruor incruentus" (Jer. Taylor, *Real Presence*, Sect. 1, § 8, Works, Vol. VI. p. 17, Eden's edition, London, 1852.) Similarly Bishop Cosin: "They make it to signify 'that Christ is not present in the sacrament either after that manner which is natural to corporal things, or that wherein His own body subsists in Heaven, but according to the manner of existence proper to spirits whole and entire, in each part of the host'... But all this, and much more to the same effect, was never delivered to us either by Holy Scripture or the ancient Fathers. And if souls or spirits could be present, as here Bellarmine teacheth, yet it would be absurd to say that bodies could be so likewise, it being inconsistent with their nature." (Cosin, *Hist. of Transubstantiation*, Ch. III. § 1, Works, Vol. IV. p. 169, A. C. L.)

So also Hooker: "There is no proof in the world strong enough to enforce that Christ had a true body but the true and natural properties of His body. Amongst which properties definite or local presence is chief.... If His majestical body have now any such new property, by force whereof it may everywhere even in *substance* present itself, or may at once be in many places, then hath the majesty of His estate extinguished the verity of His nature" (Hooker, *Ec. Pol.*, Book V. Ch. LV. § 6, Works, Vol. II. pp. 241, 242, ed. Keble. See Augustine as there quoted in note).

other side of which stood the teaching of "THE real presence" of the Body and Blood of Christ in or under the form of bread and wine.

Mr DIMOCK further expressed himself to the effect that this action of the Church of England was, he conceived, to be understood as restraining the teaching of her Ministers, not as applying a doctrinal test for her communicants.

Lord HALIFAX asked Mr Dimock whether the words in the Prayer of Humble Access in the Communion Service—"That our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body"—did not support the statements in his Paper, implying as they do the presence of the Body of Christ.

Mr DIMOCK replied that he did not recognize the necessary bearing of the words in question on the point at issue.

Mr DIMOCK was then obliged to leave the Conference, and the Chairman said he thought the Conference would wish to thank him for his assistance in the discussion.

Chancellor SMITH then suggested that no conclusion could be drawn from the words in the Prayer of Humble Access quoted by Lord Halifax, having regard to the fact that our Lord's miraculous power, even when He was on earth, was exercised equally without His bodily presence as with it.

Canon GORE, referring to a statement by Dr MOULE, in a previous Session, that our Lord was Himself present in the Holy Communion, asked in what sense Dr Moule regarded Him as present.

Dr MOULE in reply submitted the following statement as a fuller expression of what he meant :—

I believe that if our eyes, like those of Elisha's servant at Dothan, were opened to the unseen, we should indeed behold our Lord present at our Communions. There and then, assuredly, if anywhere and at any time, He remembers His promise, "where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them." Such special presence, the promised congregational

presence, is perfectly mysterious in mode, but absolutely true in fact; no creation of our imagination or emotion, but an object for our faith. I believe that our Lord, so present, not on the Holy Table, but at it, would be seen Himself, in our presence, to bless the Bread and Wine for a holy use, and to distribute them to His disciples, saying to all and each: Take, eat, this is my Body which was given for you: Drink ye all of this; this is my Blood of the New Covenant which was shed for you for the remission of sins. I believe that we should worship Him thus present in the midst of us in His living grace, with unspeakable reverence, thanksgiving, joy, and love. We should revere the Bread and the Wine with a profound sense of their sacredness as given by Him in physical assurance of our joyful part, as believers in Him, and so as members of Him, in all the benefits of His passion. Receiving them, while beholding Him, we should, through them as His equivalent signs of His once sacrificed Body and Blood, take deep into us a fresh certainty of our perfect acceptance in Him our Sacrifice, and also of our mystical union with Him as He, once dead, now lives for us and in us, thus feeding on Him in the heart, by faith, with thanksgiving. Receiving His signs, we should look up with renewed and inexpressible confidence through Him to the Father.

I do not think that the Holy Scriptures give us reason to believe that this sacred procedure (which we cannot see, but which is truly present to faith) involves any special attachment of His Presence to the sacred Signs, albeit called His Body and His Blood by reason of their equivalence as divine Tokens.

Lord HALIFAX then said he had put forward the statement now before the Conference in the hope of its being of a nature to secure general acceptance. He must now recognize that this was impossible, and that his purpose in this respect was disappointed. But he asked whether some other statement with the same object might not be put forward, perhaps by Canon Gore.

Canon GORE then submitted the following statement, in which, he said, he had endeavoured to follow, as far as it went, the language of Irenæus:—

I believe that "The bread which is of the earth receiving the invocation of God is no longer common bread, but eucharist, made up of two realities (πραγμάτων) an earthly and a heavenly," that is, the bread and wine in all their natural reality and the spiritual realities of the body and blood of Christ, which are inseparable from Christ Himself in His whole person.

Therefore as truly as with the eye of sense I behold the bread and wine, so truly with the eye of faith I am henceforth to behold Jesus Christ present to feed me with His own body and blood, sacramentally identified with the bread and wine.

The CHAIRMAN observed that his own difficulty with respect to Lord Halifax's statement lay with the first clause, since, taken in connexion with the rest of the statement, it was evident that the Body and Blood which the elements were said sacramentally to become were the Body and Blood of our Lord in His present glorified state; whereas he thought it essential to recognize that they were the Body and Blood of our Lord as sacrificed. In order therefore to put the first clause in a form in which he could accept it, he would have to introduce some such amendment as '*that the bread and wine by virtue of our Lord's institution become the sacramental equivalents of the Body and Blood of Christ as sacrificed.*' He would feel a similar difficulty with respect to Canon Gore's statement.

The Conference then agreed to close the discussion on the doctrinal part of the subject referred to them, and proceeded to consider the second part of the reference, namely, the expression of Eucharistic doctrine in ritual.

The CHAIRMAN mentioned that it would not be the Bishop's wish that the Conference should enter on the discussion of details, such as those which were the subject of legal decisions, but that their attention should be directed to the leading principles on the subject. He communicated to them some suggested statements on the matter which had been placed in his hands by Dr Robertson, who was unfortunately prevented from being present at this Session of the Conference.

These Statements were as follows :

1. *I accept ex animo the letter and spirit of (a) the Lambeth judgment in the Lincoln case, (b) the Ruling of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York on the matters lately referred to them.*

2. *I hold that ritual strongly expressive of doctrine legitimately subject to diversity of interpretation (see my printed statement, prop. 14) should not be introduced or used in a Church where its use makes worship a distress to those who have the right and duty to attend the Church in question.*

3. *Subject as above, I am in favour of reasonable varieties in ritual, conformable to Augustine's conception of the Church as glorious ab intus, but circumamicta varietatibus (Ps. xlv. 14).*

4. *I do not believe that, excepting the Rites commanded by our Lord, "most few in number and easy to be observed," the Church Universal, as such, possesses a Ritual Law.*

The CHAIRMAN thought that, as touching on legal questions, the first of these statements was outside the scope of the Conference; but it was agreed to take the others as the basis for a discussion of this branch of the Bishop's reference, beginning with the second.

Canon NEWBOLT observed that it would cut both ways, and would condemn omissions and negligences in ritual, which might be as distressing to some congregations as innovations or excesses to others.

Canon GORE said that he could see no hope of any satisfactory solution of difficulties in this respect until there was a real Church Body, and a general Representative Assembly, with the power of legislation implied in our Lord's words respecting binding and loosing, by which such questions of ritual might be decided.

Chancellor SMITH observed that there was at present no Body or Authority which could be regarded as truly expressing the living voice of the Church of England.

Dr BIGG asked whether such suggestions did not seem to imply that there was no existing authority in the Church to

which reference could be made, and he submitted that such authority did exist.

Canon NEWBOLT observed that ritual could not be entirely a matter for the choice of individual congregations, but that there must, to a great extent at least, be a general law of the Church on the subject.

Professor BEVAN said that what was needed was great latitude, but not licence.

Dr MOULE asked whether Canon Gore could mean, as his words seemed to imply, that the desired authority should decide on the ritual admissible in this, that, or the other congregation, and not for the Church at large? He thought it was most desirable that, as is expressed in the Preface to the Prayer Book, there should be one general use for the whole realm, and that Churchmen in going, for instance, from county to county, should not be liable to find themselves confronted by wholly different uses. He himself was a clergyman of more than thirty years' standing, the son of a clergyman; but if he were now asked to officiate in some churches, he would feel as incompetent to do so as if he were asked to officiate in the service of a church in Abyssinia; he would feel as a stranger in a strange land, and he thought this ought not to be possible. His own idea of worship might be entirely mistaken, but it was a great anomaly that such immense diversity should prevail.

Canon GORE said his meaning had been somewhat misapprehended by Professor Moule, and he recognized that the Church at large must have its own rules, which should supersede all rights of individual churches. But the only way to protect the feelings of congregations would be to give to some authority in each congregation rights within the limits of what was generally ordered by law: or, as Professor BEVAN then expressed it, that the particular authority in each congregation should determine the limits of ritual within the general order allowed by the Church as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN, in illustration and support of Dr Robertson's proposition, read some passages from an Essay of the late

Prebendary W. G. Humphry, Vicar of St Martin's in the Fields, contained in a volume entitled "Principles at Stake," of which the second edition was published in 1868. The title of the Essay is "The Revisions of the Liturgy considered in their bearing on Ritualism." Mr Humphry says, on page 266:

"The distinction between the liberty of preaching a doctrine and the liberty of introducing it into the service of the Church has been recently urged by the Bishop of Oxford [Bishop Wilberforce] who says, 'I do not hold that the liberty of introducing unusual rites into the Church stands in the least on the same footing as the liberty of preaching doctrine. Now, that is an important distinction, and one which the persons concerned seem to me to forget. When a ritual long established, and standing on the *mos pro lege* principle, is altered in a church, it is not only that the man who does it advances his views as a teacher of the Church, but taking advantage of his position to make actual manual alterations in the service, he makes all the congregation of the church who acquiesce in these alterations parties with him in his particular view; and there must be a distinction between the larger license given in preaching, and the smaller license given in any alteration of an existing ritual.'

"The reasonableness of this distinction is obvious. When a man speaks in the pulpit, he is understood to speak under grave responsibility indeed, but still as an individual minister; and the hearer who thinks him to be in error, however much he may be offended at the doctrine, does not consider that he becomes partaker in the error by merely listening to it. But a great hardship is inflicted on the Communicant, who is obliged to view the Church's service, in which he joins himself, through a distorted medium, by means of unusual rites symbolising a doctrine, which the Church, as he believes, has repudiated. It seems to him that he cannot take part in the service without consenting to false doctrine; and thus he feels that he is subjected to a refined sort of persecution, and practically excommunicated."

The practical conclusion at which Mr Humphry arrives is as follows (p. 292):—

“May we not be allowed to think that a not infallible Church has done well, if, on a subject so mysterious and so much debated as the Holy Communion, she has abstained from defining her doctrine with sharp and logical precision? May we not be thankful that persons holding widely different views on the subject may, so far as our formularies are concerned, kneel together, without any sacrifice of their convictions, at the table of their common Lord? And, with these feelings, must we not protest against the attempt which is now being made by the revival of obsolete ornaments and ceremonies to emphasize one view of the Sacrament to the exclusion of the other; must we not declare it to be a breach of the Concordat which has been tried and proved for three centuries, and on the whole has been found favourable to the peace and stability of the Church?”

Canon ARMITAGE ROBINSON said he thought the only possible appeal at present would be to the reasonableness of the Clergy, which ought to restrain them from imposing on congregations ritual which would distress them; and he referred in confirmation of his view and as expressing the spirit of this appeal to the following passage, at the close of the Judgment of the late Archbishop of Canterbury in the case of the Bishop of Lincoln:—

“Public worship is one of the Divine Institutions which are the heritage of the Church, for the fraternal union of mankind. The Church therefore has a right to ask that her congregations may not be divided either by needless pursuance or by exaggerated suspicion of practices not in themselves illegal. Either spirit is in painful contrast to the deep and wide desire which prevails for mutual understanding. The Clergy are the natural prompters and fosterers of the Divine instinct ‘to follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another’.” (Read and others *v.* the Lord Bishop of Lincoln: Judgment, Nov. 21, 1890. Macmillan, pp. 88 f.)

Dr BIGG again asked why the authority which now exists

is to be regarded as in so hopeless a position that no appeal to it is possible? Is the existing law to be regarded as absolutely valueless?

Chancellor SMITH said that the difficulty arises from the fact that we are under a code of dead law—under laws, for instance, passed in the reign of Henry VIII, which the Church of the present day has practically no power to alter. If that power were again given to the Church, the old laws would at once become living, as they might be repealed or amended if they had become obsolete, and if they were left standing it would shew that they were in harmony with the requirements of the present time.

Canon GORE said he had had personal experience of the position of the aggrieved parishioner, and he felt strongly that any rule laid down on the subject must be ambidextrous, and must apply in both directions.

Lord HALIFAX said there could be no question that, in introducing changes of ritual, due consideration should be given to the feelings of congregations; but the principle was applicable in two directions. He had attended churches in which there were the gravest omissions in the Services. At a place where he had been staying not long ago, no portion of the Communion service was read on the Sunday; and he feared this discussion would be useless because it was practically impossible to interfere, on one side or the other, with many details of practice, both in the way of commission and omission, which were the subject of dispute. A careful writer of admitted authority on Church History¹, not, he believed, a High Churchman, had recently expressed his own conviction that the use of the old Mass Vestments was ordered by the Ornaments Rubric. If so ordered, the propriety of their use was conceded, and a discussion of details of ritual proved useless, since there was nothing more complained of in certain quarters than the use of the 'Mass Vestments.' On the other hand, even if, for argument's sake, it could be shown that the

¹ Cf. Dr Gee's Paper on the Reformation at the Newcastle Church Congress, printed in the *Guardian*, Sept. 26, 1900, p. 1355.

various Ornaments Rubrics did not *order* the use of the vestments, it would, as long as the Ornaments Rubric remained, be quite impossible to compel their disuse; so that on this supposition also a discussion as to ritual details was shown to be useless. No doubt the Church of England could alter her Rubrics; but if she did she would have to face the consequences. For these reasons it was impracticable to take any action in the matter, and this discussion must therefore be of no avail.

Dr BARLOW observed that no one would defend omissions of plain duty such as Lord Halifax had referred to, and it was for the Bishops to correct them.

The CHAIRMAN observed that he hoped Lord Halifax was mistaken in saying that it would be impossible to obtain the disuse of the Mass vestments if they were forbidden by law; and he trusted that the gradual and considerate exercise of authority by the Bishops might be expected to be effectual.

Canon GORE said that anyone who was familiarly acquainted with the circles in which the vestments were habitually used would know that it would be impossible to secure their disuse.

The CHAIRMAN said this seemed to be a statement that there may be rulings, and even laws, which, whatever their authority, would not be obeyed.

Canon GORE said that was not his meaning, but that it was inconceivable such rules should be made by any living authority.

Dr BIGG wished to ask Lord Halifax what he meant by the *Mass Vestments*, adding that if he meant those allowed by the Ornaments Rubric, and if he understood the Ornaments Rubric to refer to the first Prayer Book of Edward VI and nothing else, many people would agree with him, and it would be a great step in advance, but that some persons seemed now disposed to go behind the first Prayer Book, and introduce ornaments and practices of a previous time, and that this caused great alarm.

Lord HALIFAX said that he was far from indifferent to the importance of promoting ritual obedience; and he had himself

proposed, as a sort of *Concordat*, that under due precautions, and with the sanction of Bishops, the alternative use of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. might be allowed, and that if this was done, the rubrics of that Book, whenever that Book was used, might be accepted as the law of the Church, and such a Society as the E. C. U. might be dissolved.

Dr SANDAY thought that we could not with advantage go any further than the appeal made by Canon Robinson to the reasonableness of the Clergy. He had heard that when Mr Balfour, in his recent speech at Manchester, had intimated that there seemed no effective remedy against certain practices, a working man observed that, in that case, he should say nothing, but should quietly walk out of church, and Dr Sanday hoped that a Clergyman would feel his responsibility for such a result. He was anxious to emphasize individual responsibility in the matter.

The Conference then passed to consider the fourth of Dr Robertson's resolutions, namely,

I do not believe that, excepting the Rites commanded by our Lord, 'most few in number and easy to be observed,' the Church Universal, as such, possesses a Ritual Law.

Dr MOULE said that this seemed to be involved in the statement of our Article XXXIV. that "every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority."

Lord STAMFORD observed that the Irish Church, with which the Church of England is in full communion, had materially modified its ritual.

Canon GORE said he thought the justice of Dr Robertson's statement could not reasonably be questioned.

Canon ARMITAGE ROBINSON, however, suggested a doubt whether it could be said that there were no ceremonies or ordinances which had become, in practice, so far the law of the Church, that they could not properly be altered by any National

Church, as, for instance, the use of the Epistles and Gospels, with which the celebration of the Holy Eucharist is accompanied.

Lord HALIFAX admitted that, as a matter of fact, there was no general ritual observed by the whole Church in the celebration of the Holy Communion, but he hesitated to admit the positive statement that no ritual was obligatory.

Dr SANDAY said that, like Canon Armitage Robinson, though not prepared at first sight to deny Dr Robertson's statement, neither was he prepared to affirm it absolutely, and must needs say *Non liquet*.

Canon GORE again urged that all controversy on this subject converged on the need for the restoration of self-government to the Church, and he hoped the Conference might agree on some expression of opinion in favour of such a reform.

The CHAIRMAN expressed a doubt whether it was within the competence of the Conference under its reference to express such an opinion. But at all events he submitted that it would be very mischievous for the Conference to make a declaration which would have the practical effect of implying that, pending such a reform, there was no possibility of obtaining obedience to authoritative rulings respecting ritual.

The time available having expired, the discussion closed, the CHAIRMAN, however, expressing regret that it had not been found practicable to discuss in principle some important questions of ritual, such as Adoration, and Reservation, and the position of the Minister, whether eastward or otherwise. The latter question no longer involved any legal difficulty, but as a matter of principle it involved the important consideration whether the Minister was mainly to be regarded, in the celebration of the Holy Communion, as representing the people to God, or whether he was to be regarded as the minister of God, offering to the people, in Christ's name, the benefits of His sacrifice. The questions of Adoration and Reservation depended mainly, of course, on the question which had been

already discussed, of the relation of the consecrated elements to the things signified by them.

The Conference then entered on a brief consideration of the nature of their Report to the Bishop, and a general agreement was intimated in the suggestion of Canon ARMITAGE ROBINSON that it would naturally consist of three parts: First, of the statements sent to the Bishop in reply to his request, and for the most part already printed; secondly, of the minutes of the proceedings of the Conference; and, thirdly, of any general resolutions which might be adopted at the close of the deliberations of the Conference. Canon Robinson himself desired to give notice that he would move to-morrow morning, in the final Session of the Conference, a motion of this nature, which would include the general acceptance of the passage from Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity," which had been put forward by Canon Gore in the first Session of the Conference.

The Bishop having intimated that he would attend the Conference for a short time at the close of the final Session the following morning, it was agreed to submit to his Lordship these views respecting the nature of the Report, it being understood that the question of the use to be made of the proceedings of the Congress, and all questions respecting their publication, were entirely for his decision.

FIFTH SESSION.

SATURDAY, *October* 13 ; 10.30—1.

The CHAIRMAN read his notes of the proceedings of the previous Session, which were corrected in some points, and generally approved.

He reminded the Conference that this Session had been reserved for supplementary discussion, and the first business before them was the motion of which Canon Armitage Robinson had given notice, namely, to add to the Report of the Conference certain statements.

Dr SANDAY desired to interpose, before Canon Armitage Robinson's motion was discussed, with some observations on a remark made by Mr Dimock at the last Session of the Conference, in reply to an enquiry whether the views put forward in the statement read by Lord Halifax were compatible with loyalty to the formularies of the Church of England. Mr Dimock had said that they were no doubt compatible with lay Communion, but that he thought them inconsistent with the constant teaching of the Reformers, and that the formularies of our Church had been so drawn up, *ex industria*, as to discountenance them. Dr Sanday desired to dissociate himself from any such opinion. He believed he could understand the process by which it had been reached, and that Mr Dimock might be right as to the intention of many of the Reformers at the beginning of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, but he considered that such intention could not be taken as the expression of the permanent mind of our Church. As far

as he himself was concerned, he had hoped that the Conference would have been able to agree upon some positive affirmation of their belief, and he was disposed to think that a statement such as that made by Lord Halifax was a tenable statement. At all events he desired to repudiate any suggestion that those who put forward or who supported such a view held a position in any way incompatible with the teaching of the Church of England. It might, as Mr Dimock had said, be inconsistent with the teaching of certain of the Reformers ; but, as he had urged, he could not accept their teaching as the fixed expression of the mind of the Church of England.

Dr BARLOW asked where Dr Sanday would look for the permanent mind of the Church of England ?

Dr SANDAY said he could not accept the opinions of one school of Divines as the expression of that mind.

The CHAIRMAN said he thought it due to Mr Dimock, in his absence, to remind the Conference that he had not based the judgment he expressed of Lord Halifax's statement upon the opinions of the Reformers, but upon the formularies of the Church, and had said that he thought these had been so drawn, *ex industria*, as to exclude such views. Moreover, he had drawn a distinction between the obligations of lay Communion and those of ministerial office, and had spoken only of incompatibility with the obligations of that office.

Canon GORE said he felt the observations which Dr Sanday had repudiated for himself affected the whole position of the Conference. To him it seemed an extremely serious thing that any reflecting person should be told that the position he had been maintaining, and trying to maintain moderately, as expressed in a statement like Lord Halifax's, is incompatible with faithful ministry in the Church of England. On the contrary, he and those who thought with him maintained that their views as expressed in that statement were by far the completest representation of the general appeal of the Church of England to catholic antiquity. He did not speak on the subject yesterday, as he did not wish to speak hastily, but he was

now speaking very seriously, as it was a painful thing to be told that views which he was doing his best to promote were inconsistent with his obligations. He did not see how it was possible to ask him and his friends to continue the Conference unless it were understood that that was not the mind of the Conference. We cannot, he said, confer except on the basis that the view we hold is not incompatible with the Church's Ministry. He asked most seriously that it should be clearly understood and expressed that the sentiment of Mr Dimock in question does not express the mind of the Conference. There are occasions, he added, when a man's self-respect requires that he should express the profoundest resentment at the position in which it was sought to place him.

The CHAIRMAN then said he thought it the duty of anyone in his position to point out that the observation of Mr Dimock was simply his own, like the observations made throughout these discussions by any other members of the Conference, and that it would hardly be reasonable to ask the Conference, as a body, to repudiate statements for which it had no responsibility whatever. If the Conference were to be asked to repudiate one statement, it might be asked to repudiate any other, and the introduction of such a procedure would be highly inconvenient. Canon Gore might take it as a matter of course that the Conference as a whole was in no way implicated in Mr Dimock's opinion; but if any more explicit assurance were needed, he was quite ready, as Chairman, to make a formal statement to that effect. At the same time he could not but observe that he thought Dr Sanday and Canon Gore attached a somewhat strained significance to Mr Dimock's observations. No question whatever of moral faithfulness to ministerial obligations was raised by such an expression of opinion. We were all liable to error, and with the most perfect faithfulness of intention it was too possible for a man to entertain a belief, or an opinion, which involved in fact an unconscious inconsistency with the doctrine of the Church. We were here discussing conflicting views of which one or other must be erroneous, and it could not be regarded beforehand as a closed question whether

the error, on whichever side, be beyond the limits allowed by our formularies. He hoped, therefore, that Canon Gore, having made the protest he deemed due to himself and his friends, would allow the matter to pass, and that the Conference might proceed to the consideration of Canon Armitage Robinson's motion.

CANON ARMITAGE ROBINSON wished to observe that, in view of what he had understood Mr Dimock to say, he desired to join emphatically in Dr Sanday's protest; and to make his meaning quite clear he asked leave to read the following words from the charge of the present Archbishop of Canterbury:—"This was the question raised by the case of Mr Bennett, of Frome. He had asserted 'the real and actual presence of our Lord under the form of bread and wine upon the altars of our churches.' He had said of himself, 'Who myself adore, and teach the people to adore Christ present in the Sacrament, under the form of bread and wine, believing that under their veil is the sacred body and blood of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.' This doctrine, so expressed, the Privy Council refused to condemn. Though it be not explicitly taught in our formularies, there is nothing in those formularies which explicitly forbids a man to hold or to teach it. It is difficult, if not impossible, really to distinguish between this doctrine and the Lutheran doctrine commonly called Consubstantiation, and it is important that it should be clearly understood that it is not unlawful to hold it, and to teach it within the Church of England." (Charge delivered at his First Visitation by Frederick, Archbishop of Canterbury, p. 10: Macmillan, 1898.) CANON ROBINSON did not desire to associate himself with the words of Mr Bennett, but he did desire most emphatically to associate himself with the words of the Archbishop, who had elsewhere said, "You cannot narrow the Church of England."

Chancellor SMITH said that he thought Lord Halifax's statement was capable of being understood in a sense which he could accept, though he should himself express it with one or two modifications or explanations. He would consequently join in Dr Sanday's disclaimer of Mr Dimock's words. He

thought, however, that the Chairman had indicated the best course to be pursued in reference to the question which had been raised.

Canon GORE then said he was satisfied with the observations and explanations which had been offered.

Dr ROBERTSON wished to express his agreement with Canon Armitage Robinson and Dr Sanday.

Dr BIGG expressed a similar agreement.

Lord HALIFAX wished to observe that :—The Church of England makes her appeal to the teaching of undivided Christendom; all laudable customs of the Catholic Church were to be maintained, and nothing was to be taught except what the ancient Catholic doctors and fathers had collected as to the teaching of Holy Scripture; more precisely an appeal was made to the teaching of at least the first four General Councils.

What was the teaching of the Church as to the Eucharist at that time was not really doubtful. From St Irenæus to St Cyril and onwards the teaching is substantially the same. There is a sacramental identification of the sign and thing signified. The bread and the wine are in the supernatural sphere the Body and Blood of Christ. St Cyril's exhortation to the communicants so to hold their hands that there should be no fear of dropping that which was more precious than gold, testifies to what was believed and taught.

This teaching of the Universal Church I believe to be the teaching of the Church of England. I do not believe that the English Reformers as a whole ever denied it. If they did so, which I should deny, their appeal to antiquity becomes a mockery; further, it was not within their competence to do so; anything they said contrary to the teaching of the Universal Church was *ultra vires*.

My object throughout has been to express, in such words and in such statements as I have attempted, this faith of the Church of England as part of the Universal Church, in language

which could be accepted, for example, by Mr Dimock, Professor Moule, and Dr Wace.

The statement I ventured to submit Mr Dimock said he could accept so far as the actual words went, but that he could not accept it because it meant *a real identification* of the sign and the thing signified, whereas *sacramental* to him did not mean any real identification of the sign and the thing signified; that it was any real presence of our Lord's Body sacramentally and spiritually present, the Reformers and the Formularies of the Church of England denied. This opinion, he said, might be held by a *layman*, but was not consistent with the loyalty due from a clergyman. Dr Wace emphasized this¹.

On this I would observe, (1) that no layman would accept such a position either for the clergy or for himself: what is of moral obligation for a clergyman is of equal obligation for a layman: and (2) would emphasize the serious grievance such a position imposes upon us. It is the grievance that clergy from whose hands we receive the Sacraments apparently *in terms* deny what we believe to be the faith of the Church of England.

This is a much more *serious grievance* than any grievance alleged to arise from excess of ritual or the revival of obsolete ceremonies, and it is useless to discuss the ritual question till the doctrinal question is cleared up, and as long as abandonment of ritual is asked for on the ground that such ritual teaches doctrine which is not the doctrine of the Church of England.

MR DIMOCK was absent from this discussion, and on reading the report of it, he addressed the following letter to the Chairman:—

¹ The Chairman must take leave to refer to his observations just above (p. 86) as expressing his meaning.

Nov. 3, 1900.

Dear Dr Wace,

I very thankfully recognize the kind consideration with which you offer me space for a few words in reply to some observations made in my absence.

I am sure I should be doing a wrong to the members of the Conference, if I were to suppose that they would have desired me, when asked a question, to have answered it otherwise than honestly according to my convictions.

The question, however, came upon me unexpectedly, and I had to answer it in haste.

And if (as I fear must have been the case) there was anything unseemly or presumptuous in the words or the manner of my answer, I desire to express my sincere regret. And I am sure the members of the Conference will kindly accept my apologies.

I hope and believe it was far indeed from my desire to be making reflexions on the conduct of others.

Believe me,

Dear Dr Wace,

Very faithfully yours,

N. DIMOCK.

The Conference then passed to the consideration of Canon Armitage Robinson's motion, which was in two parts, the first part being as follows :—

“That the following statements be added to the Report of the proceedings of the Conference which is to be presented to the Bishop of London :

“1. It has been thought desirable to draw together out of the Minutes of the proceedings of the Conference the following statements in regard to the relation of the Divine Gift to the consecrated elements.

“A. Statement by Professor Moule:—

‘I believe that if our eyes, like those of Elisha’s servant at Dothan, were opened to the unseen, we should indeed behold our Lord present at our Communions. There and then, assuredly, if anywhere and at any time, He remembers His promise, “Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them.” Such special presence, the promised congregational presence, is perfectly mysterious in mode, but absolutely true in fact; no creation of our imagination or emotion, but an object for our faith. I believe that our Lord, so present, not on the Holy Table, but at it, would be seen Himself, in our presence, to bless the Bread and Wine for a holy use, and to distribute them to His disciples, saying to all and each: Take, eat, this is my Body which was given for you: Drink ye all of this; this is my Blood of the New Covenant which was shed for you for the remission of sins. I believe that we should worship Him thus present in the midst of us in His living grace, with unspeakable reverence, thanksgiving, joy, and love. We should revere the Bread and the Wine with a profound sense of their sacredness as given by Him in physical assurance of our joyful part, as believers in Him, and so as members of Him, in all the benefits of His passion. Receiving them, while beholding Him, we should, through them as His equivalent signs of His once sacrificed Body and Blood, take deep into us a fresh certainty of our perfect acceptance in Him our Sacrifice, and also of our mystical union with Him as He, once dead, now lives for us and in us, thus feeding on Him in the heart, by faith, with thanksgiving. Receiving His signs, we should look up with renewed and inexpressible confidence through Him to the Father.

‘I do not think that the Holy Scriptures give us reason to believe that this sacred procedure (which we cannot see, but which is truly present to faith) involves any special attachment of His Presence to the sacred Signs, albeit called His Body and His Blood by reason of their equivalence as divine tokens.’

“B. Statements, (1) by Lord Halifax; (2) by Canon Gore :

(1) *‘That the bread and wine, by virtue of our Lord’s institution, become sacramentally the Body and Blood of Christ.*

'That this change is sacramental, in a sphere outside the cognizance of sense, to be accepted and therefore to be apprehended only by faith,—i.e., that to the eye of faith, since 'faith is not imagination, but believes only what is objectively true,' the bread and wine are the Body and Blood of Christ, but that in the natural order they remain what they were before.

'That expressed devotionally in the words of Professor Moule, 'I see in the Holy Eucharist, which is primarily and before all things the memorial of the Lord's death, Christ my Lord at the Holy table, coming to me and saying: This is my Body which was broken for you, this is my Blood which was shed for you,'—or, as was expressed by Canon Gore, Canon Newbolt, and Lord Halifax, 'That in every Eucharist Christ is the real consecrator,' who in the service which He has instituted for the perpetual memory of His death gives to His faithful people His Body as broken, His Blood as poured out, mystically represented and exhibited under the aspect of death by the separate consecration of the bread and wine.

'That Christ is present in the Holy Eucharist not in a corporal or natural manner, not locally as if He descended from heaven upon our altars, but sacramentally only, spiritually, after the manner of a spirit.'

(2) *'I believe that 'The bread which is of the earth receiving the invocation of God is no longer common bread, but eucharist, made up of two realities (πραγμάτων), an earthly and a heavenly,' that is, the bread and wine in all their natural reality and the spiritual realities of the body and blood of Christ, which are inseparable from Christ Himself in His whole person.*

'Therefore as truly as with the eye of sense I behold the bread and wine, so truly with the eye of faith I am henceforth to behold Jesus Christ present to feed me with His own body and blood, sacramentally identified with the bread and wine.'"

This part of Canon Armitage Robinson's motion was, after some discussion on details of arrangement, agreed to by the Conference.

The second part of Canon Armitage Robinson's motion was as follows :

2. "The members of the Conference, desiring to find a statement which should express their agreement, as far as may be, on the nature of the Divine Gift offered to us in the Holy Communion, resolved to adopt generally the words in which Hooker expressed what was acknowledged by all in his day :—

'It is on all sides plainly confessed, first that this sacrament is a true and a real participation of Christ, who thereby imparteth Himself, even His whole entire Person, as a mystical head unto every soul that receiveth Him, and that every such receiver doth thereby incorporate or unite himself unto Christ as a mystical member of Him, yea of them also whom He acknowledgeth to be His own ; secondly, that to whom the person of Christ is thus communicated, to them He giveth by the same sacrament His Holy Spirit to sanctify them as it sanctifieth Him which is their head ; thirdly, that what merit, force or virtue soever there is in His sacrificed body and blood, we freely, fully and wholly have it by this sacrament ; fourthly, that the effect thereof in us is a real transmutation of our souls and bodies from sin to righteousness, from death and corruption to immortality and life ; fifthly, that because the sacrament being of itself but a corruptible and earthly creature must needs be thought an unlikely instrument to work so admirable effects in man, we are therefore to rest ourselves altogether upon the strength of His glorious power who is able and will bring to pass that the bread and cup which He giveth us shall be truly the thing He promiseth.'

"These words are, however, to be taken subject to Hooker's opening statement in this Chapter that '*The grace which we have by the holy Eucharist doth not begin but continue life.*'"

A general agreement appeared to prevail in the Conference with the substance and purport of these words, but in respect to the proposal that the Conference should formally adopt them, Dr BARLOW questioned the wisdom of so accepting words which were in some respects of a highly technical, in others of a highly rhetorical character. They might be duly apprehended,

and accepted without risk of misconception, by persons who brought to them such knowledge of the controversy as members of the Conference possessed, but might be liable to much misconception by general readers if put forward as a formal statement of the convictions of the Conference. There were one or two expressions such as "the real transmutation of our souls and bodies from sin to righteousness" which he could not accept for this purpose.

Lord HALIFAX acknowledged that such an expression might be open to some misunderstanding, but thought that any such objection was obviated by the qualification that the passage would be only adopted "generally."

Canon GORE also urged that the phrase "adopt generally" covered such minute difficulties as those who, like Lord Halifax, were ready to adopt the passage might still feel.

Dr BARLOW said the Conference had not been called together to discuss Hooker. He felt a difficulty in resisting what seemed in some respects the general feeling of the Conference, but he was obliged to adhere to his objection. He was prepared to reaffirm any of the authorized statements of the Church of England on the subject of the Lord's Supper; but not to accept the words of Hooker as a definite *Theological* pronouncement. There was no warrant for them in Holy Scripture.

The CHAIRMAN observed that it was only true that we were not called together to discuss Hooker in the sense that we were not called together to discuss any particular document or theologian; but we were not for that reason precluded from considering or adopting any such passage. The Conference, he thought, would hardly feel that there was anything ungracious in Dr Barlow's contention; but he ventured to think that, on their part, they would be reluctant to adopt a course which would place Dr Barlow in a position so unwelcome to him.

Dr MOULE said he had been desirous of adopting, if possible, Canon Armitage Robinson's resolution, as he would have been thankful if the Conference could have united in some such

general expression of their practical convictions as is afforded by the passage of Hooker in question. But he must own he was much impressed by the justice of Dr Barlow's observations on the highly technical nature of Hooker's language. He remembered, in his early study of Hooker, how much he was struck by this aspect of his language, and by the historical knowledge which is required for its interpretation; and, on the whole, he reluctantly shared in the hesitation which had been expressed by Dr Barlow.

Proposals were made to select portions of the passage in question as not open to the exceptions which had been urged, but this course did not seem to remove the objections which had been felt.

The CHAIRMAN submitted whether, in view of the hesitation and objection which had been intimated, the purpose which Canon Robinson had in view would be gained by pressing this part of his motion; and eventually it was withdrawn.

Some suggestions were made that the Conference should declare its adhesion to the statements in the Articles and formularies of the Church of England on the subject; but it was felt that this might be deemed to go beyond the pledge now required from the Clergy by their subscription, which is simply that they "assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion and to the Book of Common Prayer," and that they "believe the doctrine of the Church of England, as therein set forth, to be agreeable to the word of God."

The deliberations of the Conference were then closed, and the BISHOP OF LONDON entered the room. The Chairman gave his Lordship a general account of the

course which the Conference had pursued, leaving a more particular account for the Minutes of the proceedings which would be presented to his Lordship. He explained that those Minutes would consist of notes taken by the Chairman. Those Notes had been read by the Chairman to the Conference at each successive meeting, and had been generally approved, but they would further be submitted in proof to each member of the Conference for correction, such corrections being limited to the purpose of more accurately expressing what was actually said, and being subject to the Chairman's concurrence.

The BISHOP approved of this arrangement, and was good enough to thank the members of the Conference for their attendance. He said that he had never contemplated taking any part in the proceedings of the Conference himself, as he desired to leave to the members entire freedom of action and discussion.

Lord HALIFAX said a few words, which were very kindly received by the Conference, thanking Dr WACE for his services as Chairman, who accompanied his acknowledgement of this kindness with an expression of his deep sense of his unworthiness to preside over such a Conference on such a subject.

On behalf of all Members of the Conference, the CHAIRMAN expressed their grateful appreciation of the Bishop of London's hospitality, and of the great advantage of the opportunities for private conversation which had thus been afforded them.

The BISHOP OF LONDON then pronounced the Benediction, and the Conference separated.

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE CONFERENCE.

- Rev. W. H. BARLOW, D.D., Vicar of Islington ; Prebendary of St Paul's.
- Rev. H. E. J. BEVAN, M.A., Rector of Upper Chelsea ; Gresham Professor of Divinity.
- Rev. C. BIGG, D.D., Rector of Fenny Compton ; author of *The Christian Platonists*.
- W. J. BIRKBECK, Esq., M.A., F.S.A. Author of *Russia and the English Church*.
- Rev. NATHANIEL DIMOCK, M.A. Author of *The Doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence ; Eucharistic Worship in the Church of England, Missarum Sacrificia, &c.*
- Rev. CHARLES GORE, M.A., D.D., Canon of Westminster.
- Viscount HALIFAX, M.A., F.S.A.
- Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, D.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.
- Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon of St Paul's.
- Rev. A. ROBERTSON, D.D., Principal of King's College, London.
- Rev. J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, D.D., Canon of Westminster ; formerly Norrisian Professor of Divinity at Cambridge.
- Rev. W. SANDAY, D.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford and Canon of Christ Church.
- P. V. SMITH, Esq., LL.D., Chancellor of the Diocese of Manchester.
- The EARL OF STAMFORD, M.A.
- Rev. HENRY WACE, D.D., Rector of St Michael's, Cornhill ; Prebendary of St Paul's.

Cambridge:

PRINTED BY J. AND C. F. CLAY,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

MPU

90244

